

## **Der Standpunkt des Epitomators. Perspektivenwechsel in der Forschung am Zweiten Makkabäerbuch**

Die Erforschung des Zweiten Makkabäerbuchs ist ein Paradebeispiel dafür, wie sehr althergebrachte Positionen beibehalten werden, selbst wenn ihnen ihre argumentative Basis entzogen ist. Erst mit Verzögerung und halbherzig zieht man zuweilen die Folgerungen aus neugewonnenen Einsichten. Eine vorentscheidende Bedeutung nimmt in der Erforschung von 2 Makk die Beurteilung der Einleitungsbriefe in 1,1–2,18 gerade in ihrem Verhältnis zu 2,19–15,39 ein. Insbesondere für die Einleitungsfragen in Bezug auf die sogenannte Epitome (2 Makk 2,19–15,39), die sich mit Abfassungsort, Thema und Entstehungszeit befassen, sind die Eingangsbriefe 1,1–2,18 von Bedeutung<sup>(1)</sup>. Während sich aber bei der Erforschung von 1,1–2,18 in den letzten Dezennien einiges getan hat, hat sich das auf die Sicht des Erzählkorpus 2,19–15,39 nicht im selben Maße ausgewirkt. Eine Untersuchung von 2 Makk und seinem Werdegang wird also zurecht bei 1,1–2,18 ansetzen.

### *1. Das Problem der Einleitungsbriefe: Einheits- und Trennungshypothese*

a) Vorfragen: Anzahl, Authentizität, Ursprache der Eingangsbriefe

In der ersten Hälfte des vergangenen Jahrhunderts konnte man noch darüber streiten, ob 1,1–2,18 drei, zwei oder einen Brief enthalten<sup>(2)</sup>. Heute besteht darin Einmütigkeit, zwei Briefe vorzufinden: 1,1–

<sup>(1)</sup> B. NIESE, "Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der makkabäischen Erhebung", *Hermes* 35 (1900) 268–307, 453–527, hier 277: Der Kern der Sache liegt in der Frage nach der Echtheit des Proömiums und seinem Verhältnis zur nachfolgenden Geschichte.

<sup>(2)</sup> Vgl. J. WELLHAUSEN, "Ueber den geschichtlichen Wert des zweiten Makkabäerbuchs, im Verhältnis zum ersten", *NGWG.PH* 2 (1905) 117–163, hier 118–120; B. MOTZO, *Saggi die storia e letteratura giudeo-ellenistica* (Contributi alla scienza dell' antichità 5; Firenze 1924) 66–76; H. BEVENOT, *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher* (Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments IV/4; Bonn 1931) 170–172; Ch. HABICHT, *2. Makkabäerbuch* (JSHRZ. 1. Historische und legendarische Erzählungen 3, Gütersloh 1976) 199.

10a und 1,10b–2,18, wobei 1,1–10a in V. 7b.8 ein Zitat aus einem älteren Brief referiert. Die Diskussion um die Echtheit der Briefe zog sich länger hin. Den ersten Brief sieht man heute, ebenso wie das in ihm enthaltene Zitat aus einem früheren Schreiben (1,7b-8), als authentisch an; der zweite Brief gilt mehrheitlich als fingiert<sup>(3)</sup>. Für beide Einschätzungen sprechen chronologische Erwägungen. Denn es ist kein Grund ersichtlich, weshalb der erste Brief ausgerechnet 124 v.Chr. und der in ihm wiederum referierte Brief (V. 7b.8) genau 143/142 v.Chr. abgefasst sein wollen, es sei denn, die beiden Daten geben ihren wahren Entstehungstermin an. Dagegen ergeben sich für den zweiten Brief zeitliche Probleme. Hier wirkt sich nämlich (wie für die Beurteilung von 2 Makk insgesamt) das Bekanntwerden des genaueren Todesdatums von Antiochus IV. durch die seleukidische Quelle BM 35603 maßgeblich aus: Denn für den zweiten Brief, der nach der Rückeroberung des Tempels und dem Tod Antiochus' IV. (1,13-16) und vor der Tempelweihe (1,18; 2,16) 164 v.Chr. geschrieben sein will, öffnet sich nach herkömmlicher Chronologie (wenn überhaupt) ein nur so kleines Zeitfenster, dass für eine Korrespondenz mit Ägypten keine Zeit mehr bleibt. Für einen Fälscher böte sich jedoch kein symbolträchtigeres Entstehungsdatum als das Wendejahr 164 v.Chr. an. Legt man allerdings die alternative Datierung der Tempelweihe in das Jahr 165 v.Chr. zu Grunde, wie sie zuerst von K. Bringmann vertreten wurde<sup>(4)</sup>, ist diese Argumentation nicht mehr derart zwingend. Selbst die Beweisführung Ch. Habichts ist angreifbar, wenn er formuliert: "Da es vielmehr durch die Urkunde 11,27 feststeht, daß die Gerusie im Jahre 164 als Organ der hellenistischen Reformer um Menelaos in Funktion war, ist ihre Erwähnung im vorliegenden Brief das vielleicht eindeutigste Indiz, daß er nicht authentisch ist"<sup>(5)</sup>. Denn "that the organization of the Sanhedrin had not been changed

<sup>(3)</sup> Vgl. HABICHT, 2. *Makkabäerbuch*, 199,201-202. Einen Meilenstein in der Erforschung von 2 Makk 1,1–2,18 bildet die Untersuchung von E. BICKERMANN, "Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr. (II Macc 1,1-9)", *ZNW* 32 (1933) 233-254. Sie dient seither als Grundlage jeder Diskussion. Zur Gegenposition vgl. B.Z. WACHOLDER, "The Letter from Judah Maccabee to Aristobulus. Is 2 Maccabees 1:10b-2:18 Authentic?", *HUCA* XLIX (1978) 89-133; Th. FISCHER, "First and Second Maccabees", *ABD* 4 (1992) 439-450, hier 444.

<sup>(4)</sup> K. BRINGMANN, *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa*. Eine Untersuchung zur jüdisch-hellenistischen Geschichte (175-163 v.Chr.) (AAWG.PH 3.Ser. 132; Göttingen 1983) 15-28. Näheres unten unter 4.

<sup>(5)</sup> HABICHT, 2. *Makkabäerbuch*, 201-202.

through the various coups which had taken place at the Temple" <sup>(6)</sup>, die Gerusie also ihre konservative Prägung hat beibehalten können, geht aus ihrem Protest gegen das Finanzgebahren des Menelaus (4,44) hervor. Am ehesten dürfte die völlig unhistorische Darstellung des Todes Antiochus' IV. (1,13-17) <sup>(7)</sup> und die phantastische Stilisierung des Briefempfängers Aristobul zum Lehrer des Pharao (1,10) für den fiktionalen Charakter des Briefes sprechen.

Laut R. Hanhart ist aus stilistischen Gründen ein semitisches Original "für den ersten Brief nahezu sicher, für den zweiten mit guten Gründen anzunehmen, obwohl der einzig mögliche direkte Beweis aus einer falsch übersetzten Stelle nicht geleistet werden kann" <sup>(8)</sup>. Formal besteht nach E. Bickermann das Präskript des ersten Briefes aus einer semitisch-griechischen Mischform, woraus er auf eine griechische Umsetzung eines semitischen Originals schließt <sup>(9)</sup>. Allerdings weist das Zitat aus der Septuagintafassung von Ps 36,19 / 37,19 <sup>(10)</sup> in 2 Makk 1,5 in eine andere Richtung. Entweder wurde der erste Brief also auf Hebräisch oder Aramäisch abgefasst und später ins Griechische übertragen, wobei der Übersetzer in V. 5 eine bewusste Bezugnahme auf die Septuaginta vornahm; oder der Autor schrieb griechisch, dachte aber aramäisch und nutzte Septuagintatexte für seinen Brief. Die Frage sollte in der Schwebe bleiben.

#### b) Die Einheitlichkeitshypothese

In der Rezeption von 2 Makk galten die Einleitungsbriefe traditionell als integraler Bestandteil des Buches <sup>(11)</sup>. Auch innerhalb der kritischen Exegese haben sich einige Exegeten dieser Position angeschlossen <sup>(12)</sup>: "Dieser Einleitungsbrief, wie er sich gibt, ist die

<sup>(6)</sup> L. FINKELSTEIN, *The Pharisees. The Sociological Background of their Faith* (The Morris Loeb Series II; Philadelphia, PA 1962) 590.

<sup>(7)</sup> A. MOMIGLIANO, "The Second Book of Maccabees", *CP* 70 (1975) 81-88, hier 84.

<sup>(8)</sup> R. HANHART, *Zum Text des 2. und 3. Makkabäerbuches*. Probleme der Überlieferung der Auslegung und der Ausgabe (MSU 7 [=NGWG.PH 13]; Göttingen 1961) [427-486], hier 28 [450].

<sup>(9)</sup> BICKERMANN, "Festbrief", 233-254, hier 245-246; zustimmend: F. PARENTE, "Gerusalemme", *L'Ellenismo* (Hrsg. G. CAMBIANO – L. CANFORA – D. LANZA) (Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica I/II; Roma 1993) 553-624.

<sup>(10)</sup> So richtig BICKERMANN, "Festbrief", 251.

<sup>(11)</sup> Vgl. C.L.W. GRIMM, *Das zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Maccabäer* (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments 4; Leipzig 1857) 25.

<sup>(12)</sup> Vgl. etwa L. HERZFELD, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel von Vollendung des*

Vorrede zur nachfolgenden Epitome aus Iason, und ist daher vom Epitomator verfasst, nicht von Iason" (<sup>13</sup>). In neuerer Zeit hat vor allem J.G. Bunge zugunsten dieser Erklärung argumentiert. Zwar bezieht er in seine Untersuchung verstärkt eine diachrone Sichtweise mit ein (<sup>14</sup>); dennoch schreibt er die entscheidenden Bearbeitungen der beiden Einleitungsbriefe und des Geschichtsberichts ein und demselben Autor zu (<sup>15</sup>). Insbesondere zwischen zweitem Einleitungsbrief (1,10b-2,18) und Verfasservorwort (2,19-32) sieht er einen kontinuierlichen Zusammenhang (<sup>16</sup>). Doch hat die exegetische Kritik auf gewichtige Differenzen zwischen Geschichtsauszug und zweitem Brief aufmerksam gemacht (<sup>17</sup>): Der zweite Einleitungsbrief erwartet eine nationale Auferstehung durch die Sammlung der Diaspora am Zionsheiligtum (2,18; vgl. 1,27-29; 2,7); die Epitome formuliert keine Erwartungen an die Diasporajuden, vertritt aber eine individuelle Auferstehungshoffnung (7,9.11.14.22-23.28-29; 12,43; 14,46), die in den Einleitungsbriefen wiederum keine Rolle spielt. Vor allem aber sind die in 1,13-17 geschilderten Umstände des Todes von Antiochus IV. nicht mit denen von 2 Makk 9 vereinbar.

### c) Abstriche an der Einheitshypothese

Die Mehrzahl der Exegeten fasst deshalb den zweiten Brief als Fremdkörper auf und teilt die Einschätzung A. Momiglianos und Ch. Habichts, die Epitome sei nicht in Einheit mit dem zweiten, sondern "geradezu als Anlage" (<sup>18</sup>) zum ersten Einleitungsbrief zu sehen. Dann

---

*zweiten Tempels bis zur Einsetzung des Makkabäers Schimon zum hohen Priester und Fürsten 1* (Leipzig <sup>2</sup>1863) 443-446; C.F. KEIL, *Die Bücher der Makkabäer* (Leipzig 1875) 274; NIESE, "Kritik", 277-292; H. HERKENNE, *Die Briefe zu Beginn des zweiten Makkabäerbuches (1,1 bis 2,18)* (Freiburg 1904) 23-25; A. MOMIGLIANO, *Prime linee di storia della tradizione maccabea* (Amsterdam <sup>2</sup>1968) 78.

(<sup>13</sup>) NIESE, "Kritik", 278.

(<sup>14</sup>) J.G. BUNGE, *Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch*. Quellenkritische, literarische, chronologische und historische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch als Quelle syrisch-palästinischer Geschichte im 2. Jh. v. Chr. (Diss. Bonn 1971) besonders 203-204. Vgl. bereits J. MOFFATT, "2 Maccabees" (APOT 1. Apocrypha, Oxford <sup>2</sup>1968) 125-131, hier 130 und S. ZEITLIN – S. TEDESCHE, *The Second Book of Maccabees* (JAL; New York 1954) 19, 24, 38-39.

(<sup>15</sup>) BUNGE, *Untersuchungen*, 153-163.

(<sup>16</sup>) BUNGE, *Untersuchungen*, 155-156.

(<sup>17</sup>) Vgl. D. ARENHÖVEL, *Die Theokratie nach dem 1. und 2. Makkabäerbuch* (WSAMA.T 3; Mainz 1967) 110-111.

(<sup>18</sup>) HABICHT, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, 174; vgl. A. MOMIGLIANO, "Second Book", 83.



entspricht die Abfassungszeit der Epitome dem Briefdatum von 1,10a. Die spätere Einfügung des zweiten Briefes habe schließlich zu den schon oft erwogenen "Umstellungen im Bericht geführt" <sup>(19)</sup>. Allerdings hat auch diese Erklärung ihre Schwierigkeiten, denn der Zusammenhang zwischen erstem Brief und Epitome ist nicht so problemlos, wie es diese Sicht gerne hätte <sup>(20)</sup>: Die Geschichtsdarstellung stellt dem Tempelweihfest (8,10) den Nikanortag (15,36) gleichberechtigt an die Seite, der in den Briefen keine Rolle spielt. Auch formal sind die beiden Briefe und die Epitome klar voneinander getrennt. Eindeutig eröffnet erst das Vorwort des Epitomators 2,19-32 die Geschichtsdarstellung. Und weder kündigt einer der Festbriefe in irgendeiner Form die Epitome an, noch greift diese auf einen der Briefe zurück <sup>(21)</sup>.

Bemerkenswerterweise nehmen die Autoren von Einleitungsbriefen und Geschichtsauszug konträre Positionen ein: Ganz im Unterschied zur Geschichtsdarstellung scheinen nämlich beide Einleitungsschreiben einen dezidiert prohasmonäischen Standpunkt zu vertreten. Der zweite Brief feiert nicht nur den Makkabäer Judas in der Nachfolge der Kulthüter Mose, Salomo, Jeremia und Nehemia (1,18-32; 2,8-13) als zweiten Nehemia (2,14f), sondern beansprucht für sich sogar makkabäische Urheberschaft (1,10b) und behauptet 1,12 für die Makkabäer, Werkzeug Gottes zu sein. Gerade aber auch der erste Brief gibt sich als offizielles Dokument des hasmonäischen Gemeinwesens (1,1), die Verfasser identifizieren sich mit den makkabäischen Kulturneuerern von 164 v.Chr. (1,8). Als Antipoden benennen sie den Oniaden Jason, nicht den historischen Widerpart der Makkabäer, den nicht-zadokidischen Menelaos. Das ist aus hasmonäischer Perspektive verständlich, denn sie — ebenfalls nicht aus hoherpriesterlicher Linie — hatten Grund die zadokidische Konkurrenz der Oniaden zu

<sup>(19)</sup> HABICHT, 2. *Makkabäerbuch*, 175; ebenso MOMIGLIANO, "Second Book", 82; s. auch unter 1.4.

<sup>(20)</sup> Vgl. auch S. VON DOBBELER, *Die Bücher 1, 2 Makkabäer* (NSK.AT 11; Stuttgart 1997) 148-149.

<sup>(21)</sup> Vgl. zu dieser Diskussionsrichtung ARENHÖVEL, *Theokratie*, 109-112; O. EISSFELDT, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament unter Einschluß der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen sowie der apokryphen- und pseudepigraphenartigen Qumrān-Schriften*. Entstehungsgeschichte des Alten Testaments (NTG; Tübingen 1976) 786-787; U. KELLERMANN, *Auferstanden in den Himmel*. 2 Makkabäer 7 und die Auferstehung der Märtyrer (SBS 95; Stuttgart 1979) 13; K.-D. SCHUNCK, "Makkabäer/Makkabäerbücher" (TRE 21; Berlin 1991) 736-745, hier 739; TH. FISCHER, "First and Second Maccabees" (ABD 4; New York u.a. 1992) 439-450, hier 447.

diskreditieren, die ja zeitgleich im ägyptischen Leontopolis ein Gegenheiligtum betrieben. Die Epitome verklärt hingegen Onias (3,1.9-12.16f.21.31-35; 4,1-7; 15,12) und verhält sich der Hasmonäerdynastie gegenüber eher zurückhaltend (vgl. unten 7.1.).

#### d) Die Trennungshypothese

Eine Reihe von Forschern zieht die Konsequenzen aus derartigen Beobachtungen und schließt auf die Unabhängigkeit der beiden Briefe voneinander und vom Geschichtsauszug<sup>(22)</sup>. Tatsächlich vermögen alle beobachteten Konvergenzen zwischen den Briefen und der Epitome die beschriebenen Unterschiede nicht aufzuwiegen. So schlägt R. Doran eine theologisch weniger anspruchsvolle Erklärung für das Nebeneinander von Briefen und Epitome vor: "Why could the situation in 2 Maccabees not be due to the storing practices at Jewish archives?"<sup>(23)</sup>. Die kurzen Briefe sollten neben dem Geschichtsextrakt auf einer Schriftrolle Platz finden. So wären die Briefe und der Geschichtsauszug jeweils relativ eigenständig, vergleichbar mit den Psalmen, den Klageliedern oder den zwölf Kleinen Propheten.

Methodisch müssten dann alle drei Buchbestandteile je für sich interpretiert werden. Allerdings werben für fast alle Befürworter dieser Trennungshypothese alle drei Buchteile zugunsten des Jerusalemer Tempels und der Mitfeier seines Wiedereinweihungsfestes<sup>(24)</sup>.

<sup>(22)</sup> Vgl. GRIMM, *Maccabäer*, 22-25; R. LAQUEUR, *Kritische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch* (Straßburg 1904) 52-71; D. ARENHÖVEL, *Theokratie*, 110-111; J.R. BARTLETT, "2 Maccabees", *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge 2003) 832; V. PARKER, "The Letters in II Maccabees. Reflexions on the Book's Composition", *ZAW* 119 (2007) 386-402, hier 386-389, 400-402.

<sup>(23)</sup> R. DORAN, *Temple Propaganda. The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (CBQ.MS 12; Washington 1981) 113; ähnlich erwägt S. VON DOBBELER, *I, 2 Makkabäer*, 149: "Unter dem Stichwort, chanukkafest' wurden Schriften, die dieses zum zentralen Thema hatten, wie die Briefe und die Epitome gesammelt und zusammen überliefert". Allerdings zieht sie aus dieser Erkenntnis nicht die Konsequenzen für die Interpretation von 2 Makk, sondern erklärt die Geschichtsdarstellung von den Einleitungsbriefen und ihrem gemeinsamen Nenner, dem Chanukkafest, her (vgl. S. VON DOBBELER, *I, 2 Makkabäer*, 150-151, 163).

<sup>(24)</sup> Ausnahmen stellen dar: ARENHÖVEL, *Theokratie*, 100-114; E. HAAG, *Das hellenistische Zeitalter. Israel und die Bibel im 4. bis 1. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 9; Stuttgart 2003) 152-167; E. HAAG, "Theokratie und Eschatologie in 2 Makkabäer 1-2. Das Zeugnis der beiden Einleitungsbriefe", *Gottes Wege suchend. Beiträge zum Verständnis der Bibel und ihrer Botschaft. Festschrift für Rudolf Mosis zum 70. Geburtstag* (Hrsg. F. SEDLMEIER) (Würzburg 2003) 87-110.

Hinsichtlich der Epitome verweisen die Ausleger auf die gehäufte rühmende Erwähnung des Heiligtums im Geschichtsauszug. Doch dürfte diese Beobachtung allein noch nicht genügen, die Intention des Auszugs zu bestimmen. Anscheinend sind die Vertreter der Trennungshypothese bei der Beurteilung der Epitome noch ganz von der traditionellen Einheitshypothese geprägt. Denn solange man die Einheit von 2 Makk 1–15 voraussetzt, wie dies die Tradition annahm, erscheint mir die Tempelthematik als durchgehendes Motiv in 2 Makk nicht nur naheliegend, sondern fast alternativlos. Bei einer (entstehungsgeschichtlichen) Eigenständigkeit von Briefen und Geschichtsauszug wird diese Interpretation jedoch fraglich. Dann genügt es methodisch nämlich nicht, dass eine allen drei Buchteilen gemeinsame Thematik wie ein kleinster gemeinsamer Nenner die Einheiten zusammenbindet, ohne dass man auf ihren jeweiligen Eigencharakter achtet; der Zielpunkt jedes selbständigen Bestandteils ist je für sich zu erheben um den intentiones auctorum gerecht zu werden. Und da scheint mir die Tempelthematik nicht automatisch Zentralthema eines jeden Buchteils zu sein.

Der erste Brief vertritt in 1,2-8 eine Tun-Ergehen-Theologie, die gerade in prekären Situationen, welche aus Fehlverhalten resultieren (vgl. V. 5), zur Orientierung an Gott aufruft und sich daraus erneutes Wohlergehen verspricht<sup>(25)</sup>. Das geschieht in V. 2-6 prospektiv-appellativ, im Rekurs auf einen früheren Brief in V. 7-8 jedoch retrospektiv-narrativ. Erst in V. 9 folgt die Aufforderung, das Hanukkafest mitzufeiern. Ob diese praktische Konsequenz der Zielpunkt des gesamten Schreibens oder nur eine untergeordnete Folgerung aus der Hauptsache V. 2-8 darstellt, ist kaum zu entscheiden. Eine Festlegung in dieser Frage bedürfte näherer Kenntnisse der damaligen Kommunikationssituation. Den zweiten Brief durchzieht eine sehnsüchtige Hoffnung auf eine baldige Zusammenführung Israels mit dem Heiligtum als Mittelpunkt: 1,27-29; 2,7-8.17-18. Mit guten Gründen kann daher S. von Dobbeler formulieren: "Die endzeitliche Sammlung Israels ist meines Erachtens das eigentliche Leitmotiv des Briefes"<sup>(26)</sup>. So macht schon diese knappe Sondierung innerhalb der Einleitungsbriege die Heterogenität deutlich, die 2 Makk innewohnt.

Auch für D.R. Schwartz darf das der Einheitshypothese verdankte einlinige Grundverständnis des Buches unter den veränderten Voraussetzungen (der unterschiedlichen Herkunft von Briefen und

<sup>(25)</sup> Vgl. BICKERMANN, "Festbrief", 252-253.

<sup>(26)</sup> VON DOBBELER, 1, 2 *Makkabäer*, 168.

Hauptteil) nicht unhinterfragt übernommen worden<sup>(27)</sup>; der Aussageabsicht des Epitomators ist eigens nachzugehen. Laut D.R. Schwartz und É. Nodet sind die Eingangsbriefe dem Erzählkorpus erst durch eine Bearbeitung vorangestellt worden<sup>(28)</sup>. Diese Redaktion habe ebenfalls 10,1-8 in die Erzählung eingetragen. Damit sei die Originalerzählung, die ursprünglich auf den Nikanortag hinauslief, auf das Tempelweihfest umgebogen worden. Damit bestimmen die Einleitungsbriefe durch die redaktionskritische Hintertür dann doch noch das Gesamtverständnis von 2 Makk.

Diese attraktive Lösung schlägt zwei Fliegen mit einer Klappe: sie erklärt einerseits (1) das problematische Verhältnis der Einführungsbriefe zum Geschichtswerk; eine engere Anbindung der Einleitungsbriefe an das Erzählwerk scheint in jüngster Zeit wieder im Kommen zu sein, wie die Stellungnahmen Th.A. Bergrens, J.W. van Hentens und E. Haags zu erkennen geben<sup>(29)</sup>. Zugleich (2) entledigen sich D.R. Schwartz und É. Nodet der crux, die die oft diskutierte Stellung von 10,1-8 aufwirft. D.R. Schwartz und É. Nodet spitzten mit ihrem Vorschlag nämlich eine verbreitete Einschätzung von 10,1-8 nochmals zu, derzufolge 10,1-8 von seinem ursprünglichen Ort vor 2 Makk 9 hinter das Kapitel gestellt worden sei. Ein Hauptargument für diese Sicht spielt neben der in 1 Makk gebotenen Abfolge von Wiedergewinnung des Tempels (1 Makk 4,36-61) und Tod des Antiochus (1 Makk 6,1-17) vor allem der Umstand, dass 2 Makk 10,9 an das Ableben des Antiochus (9,1-29) anschließe und durch 10,1-8 davon abgetrennt werde. Doch wiegt dies Argument weniger, wenn man 10,9 als Struktursignal des Makrotexs bedenkt: Der Vers schließt nicht nur den Todesbericht Antiochus' IV. in 2 Makk 9 ab, sondern die gesamte Herrschaftszeit des Königs in 4,7–10,9 — und bildet mit der Eröffnung 10,10 eine Einheit. Dann gehört V.9 nicht mehr so eng zu 2 Makk 9, wie man zunächst glauben könnte.

<sup>(27)</sup> D. R. SCHWARTZ, *2Maccabees* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin – New York 2008) 521.

<sup>(28)</sup> SCHWARTZ, *2Maccabees*, 8-10, 372, 525-529; É. NODET, *La crise maccabéenne*. Historiographie juive et traditions bibliques (Collection 'Josèphe et son temps' 6) (Paris 2005) 133-138.

<sup>(29)</sup> Vgl. TH.A. BERGEN, "Nehemiah in 2 Maccabees 1:10-2:18", *JSJ* 28 (1997) 249-270, hier 267-270; J.W. VAN HENTEN, "2 Maccabees as a History of Liberation", *Jews and Gentiles in the Holy Land in the Days of the Second Temple, The Mishnah and the Talmud*. A Collection of Articles (Hrsg. M. MOR u.a., Jerusalem 2003) 62-86; HAAG, *Zeitalter*, 152-167; HAAG, "Theokratie", 87-110.

Ein Schwachpunkt dieses Lösungsvorschlags liegt in seiner Methodenfolge: er ordnet literarkritische Schritte der synchronen Analyse vor und gelangt so zwangsläufig zu literarkritischen Operationen. Eine wichtige Entscheidungshilfe hinsichtlich der Originalität von 10,1-8 wird einerseits die Strukturanalyse des Geschichtsberichts liefern. Andererseits können schon vorab inhaltliche Erwägungen einen Hinweis geben: Denn es ist doch kaum vorstellbar, dass der Geschichtsreport das Hauptereignis des Jahrhunderts, die Rückgewinnung des Heiligtums, einfach hätte übergehen können, wie D.R. Schwartz und É. Nodet voraussetzen. Sie zerschneiden den gordischen Knoten doch wohl eher, als dass sie ihn lösen. Im Folgenden ist die Geschichtsdarstellung daher eigenständig auf Inhalt und Form hin zu untersuchen, um ihre Intention für sich und im Zusammenhang mit den Eingangsbriefen hin zu ermitteln.

## 2. Der literarische Charakter der Epitome

Wie der Autor von 2 Makk bekennt (2,19-32; 15,37-39), legt er eine Kurzfassung (Epitome) eines fünfbandigen Werkes eines ansonsten unbekannten Jason von Kyrene vor. Die Forschung kennt dabei zwei Extrempositionen im Verhältnis der beiden Verfasser zueinander: Immer wieder wurde (1) die Berufung des Epitomators auf die Textvorlage des Jason im Vor- und Nachwort als Fiktion und literarischer Kniff des Verfassers angesehen<sup>(30)</sup>. Diese Sicht bevorzugt wieder R. Zwick in seiner gründlichen Studie von 1998<sup>(31)</sup>. Zwei Umstände lassen jedoch die Erklärung des Epitomators glaubhaft erscheinen<sup>(32)</sup>: Einmal legen gelegentliche Unebenheiten im Auszug tatsächlich die Annahme einer Überarbeitung nahe. Und zweitens wäre es unerklärlich, weshalb der Fälscher ausgerechnet einen erfundenen und nichtssagenden Namen als Autorität bemüht hätte; pseudepigraphische Schriften wählen im Gegenteil möglichst berühmte und angesehene Persönlichkeiten.

<sup>(30)</sup> Vgl. F.-M. ABEL, *Les livres des Maccabées* (EtB; Paris 1949) XXXIII.

<sup>(31)</sup> R. ZWICK, "Unterhaltung und Nutzen. Zum literarischen Profil des 2. Buches der Makkabäer", *Steht nicht geschrieben?* Studien zur Bibel und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte. Festschrift für G. Schmuttermayr (Hrsg. J. FRÜHWALD-KÖNIG – F.R. PROSTMEIER – R. ZWICK) (Regensburg 1998) 125-149. Ihm schließt sich G. SCHMUTTERMAYR, "Makkabäer, Makkabäerbücher", *LThK* 6 (1997) 1225-1230 (hier 1227) vorbehaltlos an.

<sup>(32)</sup> Vgl. B. BAR-KOCHVA, *Judas Maccabaeus. The Jewish Struggle against the Seleucids* (Cambridge 1989) 170, Anm. 53.

Für andere (2) sind Jason und der Epitomator in Stil, Erzählabsicht und von ihrem (hellenistisch-diasporajüdischen) Hintergrund her deckungsgleich und nicht voneinander zu unterscheiden. Je nach Interesse untersucht man dann das Buch auf die Arbeitsweise Jasons<sup>(33)</sup> oder des Epitomators<sup>(34)</sup> hin. Beiden Extrempositionen — der Fiktionalität Jasons (1) oder seine völlige Übereinstimmung mit der Epitome (2) — ist jedoch eines gemeinsam: Sie schmelzen die Autorenleistung auf eine einzige Größe ein. Grundsätzliche Überlegungen führen aber dazu, sowohl Jason als auch dem Epitomator ihren jeweiligen Beitrag zuzuerkennen: Denn generell tragen in einem Redaktionsprozess sowohl Textvorlage als auch Überarbeitung zum Endprodukt bei. Diese Arbeitsteilung beansprucht auch der Epitomator. Er vergleicht nämlich sein Erzeugnis mit der Zusammenarbeit von Architekt und Maler (2,29) oder dem Mischgetränk aus Wein und Wasser (15,39). Keinesfalls ist der Epitomator lediglich reiner Reproduzent seiner Vorlage. Ein Opus auf ein Fünftel zu kürzen und es dennoch so lesbar zu gestalten, wie sich 2 Makk präsentiert, ist überhaupt nicht möglich, ohne der Schrift einen neuen Charakter aufzuprägen. Aller menschlichen Erfahrung nach ist der Epitomator weder alleiniger Urheber noch bloßer Treuhänder von Jasons Vermächtnis; er gestaltet vielmehr das vorgegebene Werk maßgeblich um und verleiht ihm ein neues Profil. In 15,38 beansprucht der Epitomator, sogar die Anlage seiner Schrift selbst bestimmt zu haben. Somit ist der Aufriss der Epitome entscheidend für ihr Verständnis.

### 3. *Der Aufbau der Kurzfassung*

Bezüglich der Makrostruktur von 2 Makk zeichnet sich ein Konsens in wichtigen Punkten ab: Unbezweifelbar umschließen Vor-

<sup>(33)</sup> Vgl. HABICHT, 2. *Makkabäer*: "Da der Verfasser nichts anderes getan haben will, als durch Verkürzung der fünfbandigen historischen Darstellung Jasons einen für breitere Kreise lesbaren Auszug in einem Buch zu geben (2,23), da er ausdrücklich versichert, auf eigene Forschungen verzichtet zu haben (2,28), und da er von eigenen Zusätzen nichts erwähnt, erklärt er sich selbst für einen unselbständigen Bearbeiter seiner Vorlage. Es ist mithin Jason, dem die Verantwortung für das Berichtete und für die Deutung des Berichteten zugeschrieben wird. Daher ist Jason die früheste und wichtigste Autorität für den Inhalt des Buches".

<sup>(34)</sup> Vgl. etwa VON DOBBELER, 1, 2 *Makkabäer*, 145-164; J.W. VAN HENTEN, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People. A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (Supplement to the JSJ 57; Leiden – New York – Köln 1997) 19-20, 295.

(2,19-32) und Nachwort (15,37-39) den Geschichtsauszug. Zudem ist eine Zweiteilung in der Makrostruktur von 3,1–15,39 unstrittig. Sie legt sich schon durch die beiden in 2,20 benannten Regentschaften nahe. Die Schnittstelle zwischen beiden Buchteilen liegt dann im Regierungsübergang von 10,8-9 vor. Fraglich ist lediglich, ob der Geschichtsdarstellung auch im Inneren eine konzentrische Struktur zugrunde liegt, oder ob beide Hälften einander parallel gestaltet sind. So favorisieren U. Mittmann-Richert und E. Haag das Modell einer Ringkomposition<sup>(35)</sup>. U. Mittmann-Richert entdeckt in 6,18–10,8 den Kern der Erzählung. Um ihn sei die Bedrohung des Tempels in 4,1–6,17 und 10,9–13,26 gelegt. Um diese Komposition sei ein äußerer Rahmen mit der zweimaligen Bewahrung des Tempels in 3,1-40 und 13,1–15,36 gespannt. Für E. Haag liegt das Zentrum in 8,1–10,9 vor, das mit 3,1-40; 14,1–15,37 und 4,1–7,42; 10,10–13,26 ebenfalls zweifach eingefasst sei.

Dagegen existieren jedoch eindeutige Indizien für einen parallelen Aufbau beider Buchhälften: „Die beiden Hauptteile der Epitome gipfeln jeweils nach dem (Straf-)Tod eines Feindes der Juden in einem Fest mit dem Beschluß, das Gedenken an diese Rettungstat Gottes für sein Volk auch in Zukunft zu feiern (10,8 und 15,36)“<sup>(36)</sup>. Diese Besonderheiten von 2 Makk sprechen deutlich für eine gleichlaufende Disposition beider Buchteile. Die Parallelstruktur erhärtet sich durch weitere Entsprechungen: Am Beginn jeder Einheit steht die intakte jüdische Tempelgemeinde. Der Abfall führender Juden vom rechten Glauben bewirkt Gottes Erziehungsmaßnahmen, nämlich die Gefährdung von Tempel und Integrität des Volkes, und schließlich bringt das Blutzugnis exemplarischer Frommer die heilsgeschichtliche Wende. Dies entspricht auch dem Geschichtsverständnis des Epitomators, das er in 5,17-20; 6,12-16 formuliert. Die sich so abzeichnende Parallelstruktur hat nach etlichen Vorgängern J.W. van Henten eingehend ausgearbeitet und begründet<sup>(37)</sup>: „A. Abfall

<sup>(35)</sup> U. MITTMANN-RICHERT, *Historische und legendarische Erzählungen* (JSRZ VI,1,1; Gütersloh 2000) 41-43; HAAG, *Zeitalter*, 152-153.

<sup>(36)</sup> H. ENGEL, „Die Bücher der Makkabäer“, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Hrsg. E. ZENGER u.a.) (Stuttgart – Berlin – Köln ‘2001) 275-290, hier 285.

<sup>(37)</sup> J.W. VAN HENTEN, *De joodse martelaren als grondleggers van een nieuwe orde*. Een studie uitgaande van 2 en 4 Makkabeeën (Diss. Leiden 1986) 25f; J.W. VAN HENTEN, „Das jüdische Selbstverständnis in den ältesten Martyrien“, *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (Hrsg. J.W. VAN HENTEN – B.A.G.M. DEHANDSCHUTTER – H.J.W. VAN DER KLAUW) (StPB 38; Leiden u.a. 1989)

führender Juden, vor allem von Hohenpriestern, die an der Seite des Seleukidenkönigs stehen oder ihn sogar gegen ihr Volk aufhetzen (Jason, Menelaos, Lysimachos, Alcimus; 4:1-5; 14:1-11; vgl. 14:26). B. Der Angriff gegen Stadt, Tempel und Volk durch den König oder seinen Vertreter (5:11-6:11; 14:12-36). C. Die beständige Treue der Märtyrer und des Razis zu ihrem Gott, ihr Leiden und Tod (6:18-7:42; 14:37-46). D. Gottes Rettung (und Epiphanie) in einer Schlacht (8:1-36; 15:1-28). E. Die Vergeltung der Untaten des Feindes der Juden und des Gegners Gottes (9; 15:28-35). F. Die Stiftung eines nationalen Festes zur Erinnerung und als Dank gegen Gott (10:5-8; 15:36)... In Kapitel 3 findet man die Elemente A,B,D und E. Andere Vorgänge, wie die Trauer des Onias, der Bevölkerung Jerusalems und der Priester, oder das Bittgebet und die Fürbitte der Priester, oder das Bittgebet und die Fürbitte der Priester und anderer Juden (...) können mit Element C verglichen werden”<sup>(38)</sup>. 2 Makk 3 bildet somit eine Ouvertüre zu dem Buch, die die Hauptthemen der beiden Zentralteile vorwegnimmt. 10,1-8 sind damit aus dem Aufbauschema nicht weg zu denken, wie D.R. Schwartz und É. Nodet vorschlagen (s.o. 1.4.); die Verse sind integraler Bestandteil der Erzählarchitektur.

Vermutlich sind die Bekenner von 6,9-11; 14,34-36 ebenfalls zu den hervorragenden Beispielen von 6,18-7,42 und 14,37-46 als deren Vorläufer zu ziehen. In Kapitel 14 gehen sie dem Glaubenszeugnis des Eleasar unmittelbar voraus und in Kapitel 6 sind sie nur durch die theologische Reflexion 6,12-17 von den beiden ausführlichen Märtyrererzählungen getrennt. Das Modell J.W. van Hentens gestattet noch weitere Differenzierungen, denn es handelt sich bei seiner Gliederung um eine Vereinfachung, wie er selbst einräumt<sup>(39)</sup>. 10,10-13,26 enthält nämlich eine siebenfache Folge: Auf eine Gefährdung (10,10.21-24; 11,1-5; 12,2-4.14.35; 13,1-9) folgt ein Bittgebet (10,16.25-26; 11,6; 12,6.15.36-37.42-45; 13,10-12), was schließlich in — durch göttliche Hilfe ermöglichten — Erfolgen der Makkabäer resultiert (10,17.27-38; 11,7-12,1.15b-34.38-40; 13,13-26).

---

127-161, hier 134-135; VAN HENTEN, *Martyrs*, 26; VAN HENTEN, “2 Maccabees”, 66-72.

<sup>(38)</sup> VAN HENTEN, “Selbstverständnis”, 134-135.

<sup>(39)</sup> VAN HENTEN, *Martyrs*, 26; VAN HENTEN, “2 Maccabees”, 69; vgl. noch: D.S. WILLIAMS, “2 Maccabees”, *The New Interpreters Study Bible*. New Revised Standard Version with the Apocrypha (Nashville, TN 2003) 1596-1597; D.S. WILLIAMS, “Recent Research in 2 Maccabees”, *Currents in Biblical Research* 2 (2003) 69-83, hier 77-78.



In 10,18-20 und 12,40 ist die Gefahr für die israelitische Religion durch das Fehlverhalten jüdischer Repräsentanten motiviert. Damit enthält der Block 10,10–13,26 Einheiten, die in Kurzform wichtige, aber nicht alle Elemente von 4,1–10,9 enthalten. Erst Kapitel 14 und 15 umfassen wieder das volle Repertoire von Glaubensabfall (14,1-10.26-27), Gefährdung (14,11-25.28-33; 15,1-20.25), Glaubenszeugnis (14,37-46, vgl. auch 14,34-36; 15,21-24.26.27a), Erfolg (15,27b-37) und Stiftung eines Festes (15,36). Nachdem das soteriologische Prinzip bis 10,9 breit entfaltet ist, kann es sich 10,10–13,26 leisten, dieses Thema beständig, aber nur kurz anzutippen. R. Doran stellte bereits 1981 fest, dass die Schlachtenerzählungen von 10,10–13,26 “miniatures of the battles described in larger extent in 2 Maccabees 8 and 15”<sup>(40)</sup> sind. Und die Anrufungen Gottes in 3,15-22; 10,16.25-26; 11,6; 12,6.15.36-37.42-45; 13,10-12 erfüllen in bescheidenerer Form eine ähnliche Funktion wie die großen Glaubenszeugnisse von 6,9-11.17-7,42. In pragmatischer Hinsicht bricht 10,10–13,26 vermutlich die hehre Märtyrertheologie von 3,1–10,9 auf das alltägliche Leben der einfachen Gläubigen herunter<sup>(41)</sup>: Nicht jeder kann und braucht ein Märtyrer zu werden; aber Gottes Heil im Gebet herabzurufen, soll die Grundhaltung eines jeden Frommen sein! Die ausgefaltete Soteriologie von 3,1–10,9 prägt jedenfalls die Lesererwartung von 10,10–13,26 und steuert sie.

Der heilsgeschichtliche Umschwung erfolgt im Bauplan des Buches in der Lebenshingabe der großen Gestalten von 6,18–7,42; 14,37-46. In dieser Erkenntnis liegt der Interpretationsschlüssel für den gesamten Geschichtsauszug. Vor der inhaltlichen Auslegung der Epitome sind jedoch noch ihre weiteren Eigenheiten und die Umstände ihrer Entstehung zu erörtern.

#### 4. Historische Zuverlässigkeit des Auszugs

Die Epitome ist vor allem religiös motiviert und weniger historisch interessiert. Ihr Anliegen ist es, nicht nur zu informieren, sondern mehr noch zu erbauen. Das ist allgemein anerkannt<sup>(42)</sup>, und dazu bekennt

<sup>(40)</sup> DORAN, *Propaganda*, 68.

<sup>(41)</sup> Möglicherweise beruht die Abschwächung des Grundschemas auch auf der Textvorlage des Epitomators, nämlich des umfangreichen Werkes von Jason von Kyrene, das die hochstehende und ausgefeilte Soteriologie von 2 Makk wohl noch nicht entwickelt hatte.

<sup>(42)</sup> Vgl. ABEL, *livres*, XXXIV-XXXV; R. ZIADÉ, *Les martyrs Maccabées: de l'histoire juive au culte chrétien*. Les homélies de Grégoire de Nazianze et de Jean Chrysostome (SvlgChr 80; Leiden – Boston 2007) 47.

sich der Epitomator in 2,25 und 15,39 selbst. Der geschichtliche Wert seiner Schrift ist allerdings umstritten. Die Mehrheit der Forscher ordnet die historische Zuverlässigkeit des Zweiten derjenigen des Ersten Makkabäerbuches unter. "An Glaubwürdigkeit steht es dem ersten bedeutend nach"<sup>(43)</sup>, formuliert etwa E. Schürer. Entscheidend ist für diese Einschätzung in erster Linie die theologische Ausrichtung von 2 Makk. Dagegen bevorzugen immer wieder vereinzelte Exegeten 2 Makk als historische Quelle. Galionsfigur dieser Richtung ist B. Niese mit seinem eingangs genannten Beitrag<sup>(44)</sup>. Nahezu klassisch ist die vermittelnde Position J. Wellhausens geworden: "In Summa fährt das 1 M. bei der Vergleichung besser, aber das 2 M. bietet manche Ergänzungen und Korrekturen"<sup>(45)</sup>. Peu à peu gewinnt allerdings das Ansehen des Zweiten Makkabäerbuches. 1) Seit B. Niese steht als Vorzug der Epitome fest, dass 2 Makk den innerjüdischen Anteil an der Eskalation des Konflikts ungeschönt beschreibt, welchen 1 Makk verschweigt<sup>(46)</sup>. Die Epitome gilt "für die Vorgeschichte des Aufstandes sogar als Hauptquelle, die in einzigartiger Ausführlichkeit Einblick gewährt in die innenpolitischen Streitigkeiten des palästinischen Judentums am Vorabend der Religionsverfolgung (2.Makk 3-5)"<sup>(47)</sup>. 2) Die Vertrautheit von 2 Makk mit der seleukidischen Verwaltung kam immer klarer zum Vorschein. Zunehmend deutlicher wurde "die ausgezeichnete und präzise Kenntnis, die 2 Makk hinsichtlich der gemeingriechischen und besonders der seleukidischen Institutionen und der im königlichen Dienst stehenden Funktionäre und ihrer Amtsbezeichnungen beweist ... Persönlichkeiten in hoher Stellung, die nur durch sein [Jasons, B.H.] Werk bekannt waren, erhalten nach und nach durch neue Inschriftenfunde schärferes Profil"<sup>(48)</sup>. 3) Nachdem seit 1954 das Keilschriftdokument BM 35603 mit der seleukidischen Königsfolge bekannt ist, ist 2 Makk auch in einem weiteren Punkt rehabilitiert. Zuvor folgte man 1 Makk in der

<sup>(43)</sup> E. SCHÜRER, "Apokryphen des Alten Testaments" (RE 1; Gotha 1896) 622-653, hier 648.

<sup>(44)</sup> NIESE, "Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher", 268-307, 453-527; jüngst ebenso D. LAMBERS-PETRY, "Makkabäer", WiBiLex 2008, <http://www.wibilex.de> (Zugriffsdatum: 01.09.2008) 2.

<sup>(45)</sup> WELLHAUSEN, "Wert", 158.

<sup>(46)</sup> Vgl. WELLHAUSEN, "Wert", 128.

<sup>(47)</sup> MITTMANN-RICHERT, *Erzählungen*, 49; vgl. L.L. GRABBE, "The Hellenistic City of Jerusalem", *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities* (Hrsg. J.R. BARTLETT) (London – New York 2002) 6-21, hier 21.

<sup>(48)</sup> HABICHT, 2. *Makkabäer*, 190.

Abfolge von Tempelreinigung und nachfolgendem Tod Antiochus' IV. Erst die Voranstellung des zweiten Einleitungsbriefts, in dem das Versterben Antiochus' IV. noch vor der Tempelneuweihe vorausgesetzt ist, habe in 2 Makk die ursprüngliche Reihenfolge — Tempelweihe, Tod des Königs — umgestellt<sup>(49)</sup>. BM 35603 hat nun gezeigt, dass die Neueinweihung des Tempels und das Ableben Antiochus' IV. nahezu zeitgleich geschehen sein können, wie es 2 Makk nahelegt. Trotzdem dauerte es geraume Zeit, bis sich die historische Erkenntnis auch in der Wahrnehmung von 2 Makk durchsetzte und die gegenwärtige Kapitelfolge als ursprünglich galt<sup>(50)</sup>. Doch auch hier ist vor verfrühtem Jubel zu warnen. Denn die relative Chronologie von Tempelreinigung und Ableben des Antiochus beruht auf der Einordnung der Ereignisse in die absolute Chronologie, und die ist wiederum davon abhängig, welche Kalendarien den Jahresangaben in den biblischen Quellen zugrunde liegen und wie sie mit der christlichen Zeitrechnung korreliert werden. Ein Minderheitenvotum, das von der seit E. Bickermann<sup>(51)</sup> etablierten Chronologisierung abweicht, versetzt nämlich die Tempelweihe in den Dezember 165 v.Chr., den Tod des Antiochus jedoch in den gleichen Monat des Folgejahres und entspricht damit der Ordnung von 1 Makk<sup>(52)</sup>. Diese Datierung hängt allerdings maßgeblich von der historischen Einschätzung der beiden Makkabäerbücher ab, und so bewegt sich die Forschung in einem klassischen *Circulus vitiosus*, in dem die

<sup>(49)</sup> So noch PARKER, "Letters", 388.

<sup>(50)</sup> Vgl. etwa ARENHÖVEL, *Theokratie*, 164-165; BUNGE, *Untersuchungen*, 278-279, der noch an der Umstellungshypothese festhält, oder auch SCHUNCK, "Makkabäer/Makkabäerbücher", 740.

<sup>(51)</sup> E. BICKERMANN, *Der Gott der Makkabäer*. Untersuchungen über den Sinn und Ursprung der makkabäischen Erhebung (Berlin 1937) 155-168.

<sup>(52)</sup> So BRINGMANN, *Reform*, 15-28; N. HYDAHL, "The Maccabean Rebellion and the Question of 'Hellenization'", *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom* (Hrsg. P. BILDE) (Aarhus 1990) 188-203, hier 199; L.L. GRABBE, "Maccabean Chronology: 167-164 or 168-165 BCE", *JBL* 110 (1991) 59-74; J.R. BARTLETT, *1 Maccabees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield 1998) 36-53; J.C. VANDERKAM, "Hanukkah: its Timing and Significance according to 1 and 2 Maccabees", *From Revelation to Canon*. Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature (Hrsg. J.C. VANDERKAM) (Supplements to the JSJ 62; Leiden – Boston – Köln 2000) 128-144, hier 133-138; HAAG, *Zeitalter*, 9-11, 62-64. Zugunsten der herkömmlichen Chronologie argumentieren z.B. BAR-KOCHVA, *Judas Maccabaeus*, 562-565; WILLIAMS, "Research", 70-71; vgl. auch SCHWARTZ, *2 Maccabees*, 11, Anm. 24, 274.

Wertschätzung einer Quelle zur chronologischen Rekonstruktion auf ihrer Basis führt und dann wieder ihren Quellenwert zu belegen scheint: Exegeten, die von einer zeitlichen Koinzidenz von Tempelweihe und Sterben des Antiochus ausgehen, schätzen 2 Makk hoch ein, während Forscher, die 1 Makk bevorzugen, zu einem Intervall von einem Jahr zwischen beiden Geschehnissen gelangen. Nichtsdestotrotz ist 2 Makk aus seinem Mauerblümchendasein hervorgetreten und gleichberechtigt neben 1 Makk getreten. Der historische Quellenwert von 2 Makk verdankt sich wohl vorwiegend der Arbeit des Jason von Kyrene, den der Epitomator als akribischen, aber auch trockenen Historiker beschreibt (2,24).

### 5. *Das Opus des Jason von Kyrene*

Nach den Angaben des Epitomators scheint das Werk Jasons von Kyrene noch durch die Kurzfassung hindurch. Eine andere Frage ist, wie Jasons Schrift aussah. Immerhin schält sich ein klareres Bild zu Herkunft, Zeit und Wirkungsort des Jason heraus: Sein hellenisierte Name zeigt unmissverständlich an, dass er ein Diasporajude aus der ptolemäischen Provinz Kyrenaika war. Lange Zeit unsicher war der Abfassungsort. Immerhin ist der Namenszusatz "aus Kyrene" nur sinnvoll, wenn der Träger sich außerhalb seiner Heimat befindet<sup>(53)</sup>. Vieles deutet sogar auf das seleukidische Territorium hin, wobei man dann bei dem Juden Jason gerne an Judäa und speziell Jerusalem denkt. Denn die seleukidische Jahreszählung (vgl. 13,1; 14,4), die doch wohl auf Jason als Quelle des Epitomators zurückgeht, ist nur in der kulturellen Sphäre der Seleukiden verständlich. Insbesondere auf Judäa deutet "nicht nur der ganz auf die dortigen Ereignisse beschränkte Inhalt seines Werkes, sondern auch die gute Kenntnis der politischen Verhältnisse und der seleukidischen Institutionen"<sup>(54)</sup>. All diese Faktenkenntnisse dürfte der Epitomator seinem Gewährsmann Jason verdanken. Wenn die Zusammenstellung der Dokumente von 2 Makk 11 auf Jason zurückgeht, wofür nicht zuletzt 2,24 spricht, dann dürfte er nur in Jerusalem Zugang zu ihnen erlangt haben. Denn sie alle sind, aus unterschiedlichen Richtungen stammend, nach Jerusalem gerichtet und können allein dort gesammelt sein. Jasons Präsenz vor

<sup>(53)</sup> Vgl. BARTLETT, "2 Maccabees", 834; anders SCHUNCK, "Makkabäer/Makkabäerbücher", 740, der für den Abfassungsort "Nordafrika" plädiert.

<sup>(54)</sup> MITTMAN-RICHT, *Erzählungen*, 45.

Ort hat also ebenso zum historischen Wert der Epitome beigetragen wie seine zeitliche Nähe. Denn bei der gemeinhin frühen Ansetzung des Epitomators noch in das zweite Jahrhundert (s.u. 6.1.) müsste Jason nah an den berichteten Ereignissen als ein Zeitgenosse des Judas Makkabäus gelebt haben.

Eine andere Aufgabe besteht in der Wiedergewinnung des Grundduktes von Jasons Werk. Hier verschwimmen quellenbedingt die Linien noch am stärksten. Dennoch ist diese Thematik bedeutsam, denn sie verhilft, die beiden Verfasser von Epitome und deren Vorlage stärker zu konturieren. Hierin liegt noch Forschungspotential. Methodisch liegen nämlich durchaus Instrumentarien bereit, mit denen zu überprüfbaren Ergebnissen zu gelangen ist. Zwei sich ergänzende Wege können zu einer Grobrekonstruktion Jasons führen: Einmal bezieht sich der Epitomator einleitend (2,19-32) auf den Charakter des Jasonwerks. Seine Charakteristik aus erster Hand hat großes Gewicht, denn solange Jasons Schrift noch zugänglich war, hätte sich der Epitomator doch kaum grobe Verzerrungen leisten können. Besonders wenn die Inhaltsangabe von Jasons Opus in 2,19-22 von der Epitome abweicht, ist auf eine Eigenheit Jasons zu schließen. Zweitens können formale Gliederungssignale, die am Aufbau der Epitome vorbeilaufen, oder inhaltliche Äußerungen, die wie Atavismen neben der Intention der Epitome stehen (geblieben sind), auf Charakteristika des Jasonwerks beruhen. So könnten die fünf Schlussnotizen von 3,40; 7,42; 10,9; 13,26b; 15,37 aus den Abschlüssen der fünf Jasonbuchrollen übernommen sein<sup>(55)</sup>. Ihnen lassen sich in etwa die Regentschaften von Seleukus IV., Antiochus IV., Antiochus V. und Demetrius I. einpassen (vgl. 4,7; 9,29; 10,10; 14,1-2), wobei die Regierungszeit Antiochus' IV. zwei Bände einnähme. Diese Struktursignale hat der Auszug übernommen, obwohl der Kurzfassung eine andere Gliederung zugrundeliegt.

Wie der Aufbau der Epitome zeigt, ist ihre Tempeltheologie lediglich ein Nebenthema. Im Inhaltsverzeichnis des Jasonwerks ist der Tempel jedoch doppelt (2,19.22) thematisiert. Der Schluss D. Arenhoevels, "Jason schrieb hauptsächlich zur Verherrlichung des Tempels und legte großes Gewicht auf das Tempelweihfest"<sup>(56)</sup> ist deshalb nicht unbegründet. Er kann dafür auf das erste Makkabäerbuch verweisen: "Es sind gerade die Stücke um den Tempel gruppiert, die

<sup>(55)</sup> Vgl. etwa SCHUNCK, "Makkabäer/Makkabäerbücher", 739; ENGEL, "Bücher", 288.

<sup>(56)</sup> ARENHOEVEL, *Theokratie*, 113.

auch schon in 1 Makk (mit Ausnahme von 2 Makk 3, das keine Parallele in 1 Makk hat), auf das Heiligtum bezogen sind. Das heißt aber doch wohl, daß in dieser Tatsache einfach die vor-jasonische Tradition sich zeigt und von daher Schlüsse auf die besondere Tendenz des Epitomators nicht zulässig sind”<sup>(57)</sup>. Da im griechischen Kulturraum die Errettung von Heiligtümern aus Feindeshand in regelmäßigen Festen begangen wurden, könnte Jasons Komposition als Ätiologie von Chanukkafest und Nikanortag gedacht gewesen sein: “Sein Werk mag wirklich eine Art Haggada zum Chanukkafest gewesen sein nebst Anhang zum Nikanortag”<sup>(58)</sup>. Ohne die Tempelthematik als roten Faden wäre Jasons Schrift kaum denkbar. In der Epitome bilden die beiden Festnotizen in 10,8; 15,36 nicht abschließende Höhepunkte, wie gerne behauptet. Dazu sind sie zu kärglich. Dramaturgisch stellen sie eher Abschwünge dar, diachron wären sie gut als Rudimente zu begreifen, die aus der Vorlage des Epitomators resultieren. Auch dass die Inhaltsangabe ausdrücklich die Brüder von Judas nennt (2,19), die in der Epitome so gut wie keine Rolle spielen, dürfte auf eine Kürzung des Epitomators hinweisen, der seine Geschichte streng auf Judas fokussierte<sup>(59)</sup>.

Frappant ist allerdings eine bisher noch nicht beachtete Inkongruenz zwischen Inhaltsüberblick und Kurzfassung: Insgesamt ist das in der Epitome berichtete Geschehen gut in der Inhaltsübersicht wiederzufinden; man vermisst in 2,19-22 lediglich einen einzigen Zentralpunkt der Epitome, nämlich: die Martyrien Eleasars und der Sieben Brüder mit ihrer Mutter sowie das Blutzugnis Rasis. Gemeinsam mit der Gliederung der Epitome, in der die Glaubenszeugnisse die Wendepunkte des Geschehens markieren, wird dadurch deutlich, dass in ihnen der Hauptbeitrag des Epitomators zu seiner Schöpfung vorliegt. Er hat mit den Märtyrererzählungen das theologische Herzstück in seine Kurzfassung eingetragen. Dieses Resultat bestätigt wiederum die Ansicht, im Schicksal des Tempels den roten Faden von Jasons Werk zu bestimmen. Die Aussageabsicht des Epitomators ist nun eingehend zu behandeln.

<sup>(57)</sup> ARENHOEVEL, *Theokratie*, 113.

<sup>(58)</sup> ARENHOEVEL, *Theokratie*, 114.

<sup>(59)</sup> Dagegen lassen sich wohl keine Schlüsse auf das Jasonwerk daraus ziehen, dass 2,20 die Könige Seleukus IV. und Demetrius I. übergeht. Eine Erweiterung der Schrift um 3,1-4,6 und 14,1-15,36 liefe der Aufgabe des Kürzers — und als solchen versteht sich der Epitomator essentiell (2,32) — doch wohl grundlegend zuwider.

## 6. Der Standort des Epitomators

Wer einen Standpunkt vertritt, kann dies nur von einem bestimmten Standort aus. Die Kommunikationssituation, der Standort, bestimmt die Aussage des Autors (seinen Standpunkt) maßgeblich mit. Daher ist es für die Rezipienten von entscheidender Bedeutung, die Grunddaten der Ursprungskommunikation zu kennen, um einen historischen Text adäquat beurteilen zu können. So gesehen bestünde in einer systematischen und detaillierten Aufarbeitung von Abfassungsort, Adressatenkreis und Entstehungszeit der Epitome ein dringendes Forschungsdesiderat, deren Aufgabe hier nur umrissen werden kann.

### a) Die Zeit

Über die zeitliche Einordnung der Epitome besteht kaum noch Dissens. Sie gilt als im letzten Drittel des zweiten Jahrhunderts verfasst<sup>(60)</sup>. Oft geht man dabei vom Datum des ersten Einleitungsbriefes aus (1,10a), als dessen Beigabe die Epitome erstellt worden sei. Wenn aber die Kurzfassung unabhängig von den Briefen entstand (wie Abschnitt 1 ergab) lassen sich die Entstehungsdaten der Briefe nicht auf das Erzählwerk übertragen. Allerdings halten selbst Exegeten, die von keinem originären Zusammenhang zwischen Epitome und Briefen ausgehen, dennoch an solch einer Argumentation für die Datierung fest. In der Tat bestehen unabhängig von den Einleitungsbriefen unterschiedlich gewichtige, aber gute Gründe zur Ansetzung des Auszugs in die letzten Jahrzehnte des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Zum einen ist nämlich ein realistisches Intervall zwischen Jasons Autorentätigkeit

<sup>(60)</sup> Anders S. ZEITLIN – S. TEDESCHE, *Second Book of Maccabees*, 27-29: 41-44 n. Chr.; J.A. GOLDSTEIN, *I Maccabees*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 41; Garden City, NY 1976) 63; J.A. GOLDSTEIN, *I Maccabees*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 41A; New York u.a. 1983) 71-83; 78/7-63 v.Chr. [ihm schließt sich an: G.W. NICKELSBURG, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. A Historical and Literary Introduction (Minneapolis, MN 2005) 110, 371; G.W. NICKELSBURG, "Torah and the Deuteronomic Scheme in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Variations on a Theme and Some Noteworthy Examples of its Absence", *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament*. Festschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag (Hrsg. D. SÄNGER – M. KONRADT) (NTOA 57; Fribourg 2006) 222-235, hier 225]; G.W. BOWERSOCK, *Martyrdom and Rome* (The Wiles Lectures at the Queen's University of Belfast; Cambridge – New York – Oakleigh, Melbourne 1995) 10-13: zweite Hälfte des ersten Jahrhunderts nach Christus.

in der Mitte des zweiten Jahrhunderts und seiner Kürzung anzusetzen: "Man muß dem Jason Zeit lassen, sein Monumentalwerk zu schreiben, und dem Epitomator, daraus einen Auszug zu machen"<sup>(61)</sup>. Andererseits lässt das positive Bild von den Römern einen Ansatz der Kurzfassung nach der römischen Machtübernahme in Palästina (63 v.Chr.) nicht zu.

Gerne wird 4,11 für die Datierung Jasons in Anspruch genommen<sup>(62)</sup>. Der Vers setzt die Vertrautheit mit dem Gesandten Eupolemus, einem Zeitgenossen Judas', voraus, da Eupolemus zur Einordnung seines Vaters Johanan dient. Den Lesern muss also Eupolemus und sein diplomatisches Geschick in einer Mission vor dem römischen Senat (vgl. 1 Makk 8,17) bekannt gewesen sein. Diese Erwägungen gelten aber in noch höherem Maße für den Epitomator. Denn die Bemerkung in 4,11 ist auch für ihn nur sinnvoll, wenn er von einer zumindest umrisshaften Bekanntschaft seiner Rezipienten mit Eupolemus rechnen kann. Ansonsten hätte er, dessen literarisches Hauptgeschäft ja die Kürzung seiner Vorlage war, die Näherbestimmung des Johanan gestrichen. Wahrscheinlicher hat deshalb der Epitomator selbst die Bemerkung beige-steuert, um seiner Leserschaft die Zusammenhänge zu eröffnen. Hat Eupolemos aber in der Mitte des zweiten Jahrhunderts gewirkt, dann dürfte der Auszug noch vor der Jahrhundertwende angefertigt worden sein.

Häufig bemüht man (vermeintliche) politische Zwischentöne der Kurzfassung für eine Datierung: Einmal (1) sei der Auszug "als kritische Auseinandersetzung mit der Politik des Johannes Hyrkan (134-104 v.Chr.) nach dem Tod Antiochos' VII. seit 129 v.Chr. zu betrachten"<sup>(63)</sup>. Innerhalb dieses Vierteljahrhunderts (129-104 v.Chr.) müsste die Epitome also entstanden sein. Oder: (2) Sie nimmt in keiner Weise zur Kritik an den Hasmonäern Stellung, wie sie um die Wende zum ersten Jahrhundert aufkam, und muss daher früher sein<sup>(64)</sup>. Das Problem der politischen Zielrichtung der Epitome wird bei der Behandlung ihrer Aussageabsicht wiederkehren (7.1.). Noch eine Vielzahl weiterer Beobachtungen wird für die Datierungsfrage in Anspruch genommen, weil sie eine Distanz zu bestimmten historischen Entwicklungen verraten. Da die Indizien offenbar jedoch

<sup>(61)</sup> ARENHOEVEL, *Theokratie*, 116.

<sup>(62)</sup> Vgl. HABICHT, 2. *Makkabäerbuch*, 175, 217 z.St.; VON DOBBELER, 1, 2 *Makkabäer*, 162.

<sup>(63)</sup> ENGEL, "Bücher", 289; vgl. DORAN, *Temple Propaganda*, 112.

<sup>(64)</sup> ARENHOEVEL, *Theokratie*, 116-117.



gegenläufig sind, lassen sie eher auf einen räumlichen als auf einen zeitlichen Abstand schließen.

#### b) Der Ort

Die Frage des Abfassungsortes ist nach wie vor offen; gehandelt werden vor allem "Alexandria als auch Jerusalem"<sup>(65)</sup>. Mitte des letzten Jahrhunderts tendierte man noch zu Alexandrien<sup>(66)</sup>, danach mehr zu Jerusalem. Zu diesem Wechsel hat mit Sicherheit auch die vielfach angenommene Verbindung von Einleitungsschreiben und Epitome beigetragen, allen voran die einflussreiche Ansicht Ch. Habichts, die Kurzfassung sei eine Begleitschrift zum ersten Festtagsbrief<sup>(67)</sup>. Die Kommunikationsrichtung lässt dann nur Jerusalem als Ursprungs- und Ägypten als Zielort zu. Häufig sah man im Epitomator einen pharisäischen Autor, dann ergibt sich eine palästinische Herkunft fast wie von selbst<sup>(68)</sup>. Besonders wenn man im Geschichtsbericht Hasmonäerkritik findet, liegt Jerusalem als Entstehungsort nahe<sup>(69)</sup>. Aber all diese Voraussetzungen sind fraglich (wie sich in Hinblick auf die Eingangsbriefe bereits zeigte [1.2. – 1.4.] und wie für die anderen Punkte noch deutlich werden wird [7.]). So haben sich jüngst wieder Stimmen gemeldet, die die Diaspora favorisieren<sup>(70)</sup>.

Viele Argumente, die bislang für die Datierung der Epitome angeführt wurden, sind in Wirklichkeit aussagekräftiger für die Bestimmung ihres Abfassungsortes. Denn die für die Datierung in Anspruch genommenen Beobachtungen dienen teils als Indizien für

<sup>(65)</sup> MITTMAN-RICHERT, *Erzählungen*, 48.

<sup>(66)</sup> Vgl. ABEL, *Les livres des Maccabées*, XXXIV; J. BARTLETT, *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (CNEB; Cambridge 1973) 218.

<sup>(67)</sup> HABICHT, 2. *Makkabäerbuch*, 174-175.

<sup>(68)</sup> Diesen Konnex schafft explizit schon A. GEIGER, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der inneren Entwicklung des Judentums* (Frankfurt a.M. 1928) 226; vgl. noch S. VON DOBBELER, "Makkabäerbücher 1-4" (WiBiLex 2008, <http://wibilex.de> [Zugriffsdatum: 29.8.2008]) 6.3.

<sup>(69)</sup> DORAN, *Propaganda*, 112-113.

<sup>(70)</sup> Vgl. R. DORAN, "The Second Book of Maccabees" (New Interpreter's Bible. Old Testament Survey; Nashville, TN 2005) 562; D.R. SCHWARTZ, "From the Maccabees to Masada. On Diasporan Historiography of the Second Temple Period", *Jüdische Geschichte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Wege der Forschung: Vom alten zum neuen Schürer* (Hrsg. A. OPPENHEIMER) (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs. Kolloquien 44; München 1999) 29-40; SCHWARTZ, 2 *Maccabees*, 45-55.

Früh-, teils für Spätdatierungen und bezeugen lediglich einen Abstand zu bestimmten Entwicklungen in Palästina, woraus man dann die Entstehung der Epitome vor, bzw. nach dem Ereignis folgert. So gelten einige Eigentümlichkeiten der Epitome als Anzeichen für eine späte Ansetzung des Auszugs. Generell ist der Geschichtsbericht nämlich von einer Fülle romantischer Verklärungen der Geschichtsfakten geprägt: Der Bezug auf die "väterliche Sprache" (7,8.21.27; 12,37; 15,29) ist ganz unbestimmt<sup>(71)</sup>, der Verfasser kann mit ihr nicht mehr viel real anfangen; umso größer ist ihr theologisches Gewicht und ihre emotionale Wertschätzung, die einer Umgangssprache kaum zuteil wird. Auch der Tempel ist eine fast ausschließlich theologische Größe, Realien sind belanglos. Der Hohepriester Onias erscheint so untadelig, dass die Glorifizierung auf der Hand liegt. Insgesamt begegnet eine "stark idealisierte Sicht der Gemeinde"<sup>(72)</sup>. Oft bemerkt ist die offenkundige Unwahrheit von 15,37, Jerusalem sei nach dem Tod Nikanors fest in jüdischer Hand geblieben. Sie ist nur aus weiter Entfernung und mit verklärem Blick denkbar. Je für sich kann man diese Züge mit dem theologischen Anliegen des Verfassers erklären<sup>(73)</sup>. Die religiösen Vorlieben des Autors darf man ein Stück weit auch für die Wunder und himmlischen Erscheinungen in Anspruch nehmen, die der Epitomator schätzt<sup>(74)</sup>. Doch ist diese Massierung, die den Gesamtcharakter des Auszugs bestimmt, nicht mehr allein mit dem subjektiven Geschmack des Epitomators zu erklären. Die Überhöhung der Fakten innerhalb der Epitome spricht für eine Distanz, die bislang als zeitlicher Abstand ausgelegt wurde, aber eher im räumlichen Sinn zu verstehen ist. Denn die Anzeichen für eine Spätdatierung stehen in Konflikt mit der akzeptierten relativ frühen

(71) Vgl. J.W. VAN HENTEN, "The Ancestral Language of the Jews in 2 Maccabees", *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben-Yehuda* (Hrsg. W. HORBURY) (Edinburgh 1999) 53-68: Obwohl die Sprache nicht näher spezifiziert ist, sei eher an Hebräisch als an Aramäisch gedacht. Obgleich es für diese Sicht gute Gründe gibt (vgl. auch D.R. SCHWARTZ, *2Maccabees*, 438), müsste ein jüdischer Autor es sicherlich ausdrücklich vermerken, wenn er eine jüdische Mutter mit ihren Söhnen nicht in ihrer aramäischen Umgangssprache kommunizieren ließe. So optiert R.D. YOUNG ("The 'Woman with the Soul of Abraham'. Traditions about the Mother of the Maccabean Martyrs", "Women like This". *New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World* [Hrsg. A.-J. LEVINE] [SBL. Early Judaism and its Literature 1; Atlanta, GA 1991] 67-81, hier 71) für Aramäisch. Aus ägyptischer Perspektive konnten beide Sprachen ineinander verschwimmen.

(72) ARENHÖVEL, *Theokratie*, 115.

(73) So ARENHÖVEL, *Theokratie*, 115.

(74) Vgl. ARENHÖVEL, *Theokratie*, 116.

Ansetzung in das zweite Jahrhundert. Sollte die Epitome aus dem zweiten Jahrhundert stammen, und davon kann man, wie oben dargelegt, ausgehen, dann kann ihr Abstand zu den Ereignissen nicht zeitlich, sondern nur ein räumlicher sein. Ebenso wenig kann ein Autor, „der mit der Geographie Palästinas nicht Bescheid weiß und mit den Ortsnamen, wenn er überhaupt welche vorbringt, keine Vorstellung verbindet“<sup>(75)</sup>, vor Ort gearbeitet haben.

Auch ein Indiz, das zugunsten einer Frühdatierung interpretierbar ist, dürfte wohl eher für eine Abfassung der Epitome außerhalb Palästinas sprechen. J. Zsengellér führt nämlich eine Besonderheit der Epitome an<sup>(76)</sup>: 5,22-23; 6,2 sprechen vom Heiligtum der Samaritaner, ohne dass negative Wertungen mitschwingen. J. Zsengellér schließt daraus auf eine Datierung vor die antisamaritanischen Aktionen Johannes Hyrkans 128 v.Chr. Danach sei eine unvoreingenommene, ja geradezu wohlwollende Erwähnung des Heiligtums auf dem Garizim nicht mehr möglich gewesen. Dieser Gedankengang ist nicht ausgeschlossen; noch besser passt eine solche tolerante Theologie jedoch in das Diasporajudentum<sup>(77)</sup>. 5,22-23; 6,2 bezeugen somit wie die zuvor genannten Beobachtungen einen Abstand der Epitome zu geschichtlichen Vorgängen in Palästina, aber diese Distanz dürfte nicht zeitlich, sondern räumlich aufzufassen sein: Der Auszug wurde außerhalb Palästinas angefertigt. 5,22-23; 6,2 sind gut aus einem Diasporakontext verstehbar, wo man größere Akzeptanz gegenüber anderen Kulturen pflegte. Insgesamt zeigt sich die Epitome dem Heidentum gegenüber ausgesprochen aufgeschlossen: „The author distinguishes between good and bad Greeks (4:35-36.49; Ptolemy Macron 10:12-13; the citizens of Scythopolis 12:30). The author shows no embarrassment that the high-priest Onias sought asylum at the temple area of Daphne (4:33), nor does he blush at connections with the Macedonians (5:9) or rule out that Jews be equated with Athenians (9:15); he emphasizes connections with the Romans (4:11; 11:34-38). The theme that the Jews are good citizens, not barbarians like those who attack them (2:21), is also part-and-parcel of this openness to non-

<sup>(75)</sup> WELLHAUSEN, „Wert“, 117-163, hier 141.

<sup>(76)</sup> J. ZSENGELLÉR, „Maccabees and Temple Propaganda“, *The Books of the Maccabees. History, Theology, Ideology. Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books*, Pépa, Hungary, 9-11 June 2005 (Hrsg. G.G. XERAVITS – J. ZSENGELLÉR) (Supplement to the JSJ 118; Leiden – Boston 2007) 181-195.

<sup>(77)</sup> Vgl. R. DORAN „2 Maccabees 6:2 and the Samaritan Question“, *HThR* 76 (1983) 481-485; SCHWARTZ, 2 Maccabees, 47.

Jews”<sup>(78)</sup>. Eine Offenheit gegenüber den Heiden, wie sie im Diasporamilieu vorherrschend ist<sup>(79)</sup>.

Es liegen sogar weitere positive Anzeichen für die Entstehung der Epitome in der jüdischen Diaspora vor: Zumindest an vier Stellen referiert der Auszug Bibelzitate. Dabei greift er nicht nur auf den Pentateuch zurück (zu 7,6 vgl. Dtn 32,36; zu 10,26 vgl. Ex 23,22), sondern scheint den erweiterten Kanon vorauszusetzen, wenn 7,9.14 auf Dan 12,2 und wenn 15,22 auf Jes 37,36 Bezug nimmt. Vor allem aber schöpft der Autor seine Zitate aus der Septuaginta<sup>(80)</sup>. Das dürfte eindeutig für Diasporakontext sprechen. Überhaupt unterstützen das geschliffene Griechisch und das gekonnte Spiel mit griechischen Formen und Motiven die Herkunft aus der Diaspora: Epiphanien, der Gegensatz zwischen Barbar und Kultiviertem, hehre Ideale des edlen Bekenntertodes von Philosophen und der (militärischen) Aufopferung (Dezimierung und *devotio*) und selbst die Spiegelstrafen, nach denen jedem die Entsprechung seines Handelns widerfährt, werden immer weiter und ausführlicher erforscht und als griechisch-römische Vorbilder des Geschehens von 2 Makk erkannt<sup>(81)</sup>. Der Geschichtsauszug gilt in der gegenwärtigen Forschung geradezu als ein Paradebeispiel einer Synthese von alttestamentlichem und griechischem Denken<sup>(82)</sup>. Der Autor nutzt Konvergenzen von biblischen und

<sup>(78)</sup> ZSENGELLÉR, “Maccabees”, 110-111; vgl. auch MOMIGLIANO, “Second Book”, 86; D.R. SCHWARTZ, “The Other in 1 and 2 Maccabees”, *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Hrsg. G.N. STANTON – G.G. STROUMSA) (Cambridge 1998) 30-37; zurückhaltender: D.L. BALCH, “Attitudes toward Foreigners in 2 Maccabees, Eupolemus, Esther, Aristes, and Luke-Acts”, *The Early Church in its Context. Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson* (Hrsg. A.J. MALHERBE – F.W. NORRIS – J.W. THOMPSON) (NT.S XC; Leiden – Boston – Köln 1998) 22-47, hier 23-34.

<sup>(79)</sup> Vgl. M. HENGEL, *Judentum und Hellenismus*. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh.s v. Chr. (WUNT 10; Tübingen<sup>3</sup>1988) 306-307.

<sup>(80)</sup> Vgl. D.R. SCHWARTZ, “On Something Biblical About 2 Maccabees”, *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996 (Hrsg. M. STONE – E.G. CHAZON) (StTDJ XXVIII; Leiden – Boston – Köln 1998) 223-232, hier 228-232; A. VAN DER KOOIJ, “The Use of the Greek Bible in II Maccabees”, *JNWSL* 25 (1999) 127-138.

<sup>(81)</sup> Vgl. exemplarisch DORAN, *Propaganda*, 94-109; VAN HENTEN, *Martyrs*.

<sup>(82)</sup> Vgl. BARTLETT, *Books*, 216-217; R. WEBER, “Makkabäerbücher”, *NBL* II (1995) 690-696, hier 694.

hellenistischen Vorstellungen und erreicht damit die größtmögliche Plausibilität für seine Ideen bei seinen jüdisch-hellenistischen Rezipienten. Genau diese Leserschaft ist in der Diaspora anzutreffen, und der Epitomator hatte augenscheinlich solche hellenistisch geprägten Diasporajuden als Zielgruppe vor Augen.

Grundsätzlich könnte die Epitome in der gesamten hellenistischen Diaspora des zweiten vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts entstanden sein. Die Forschung an den Büchern der Septuaginta verengt den Blick zu oft auf die ägyptische Diaspora. Was den Entstehungsort des Geschichtsauszugs betrifft, wird Ägypten jedoch zurecht als erster Kandidat der Diaspora gehandelt. Denn die Kommunikationsrichtung der Einleitungsbriefe macht es wahrscheinlich, dass die Schriften dort gesammelt wurden. So liegt es nahe, dass der Epitomator am Nil wirkte, und hier wiederum wäre zuerst an die kulturelle Metropole Alexandrien zu denken. In diesem kreativen Zentrum des Diasporajudentums wird man auch die Adressaten der Epitome vermuten dürfen. Ihre spezielle Situation ist erst zu erschließen, wenn die Aussageabsicht des Epitomators klarer hervortritt.

### 7. Der Standpunkt: das Anliegen des Epitomators

Nachdem die literarische Gestalt der Epitome, ihr historischer Kontext, ihre Vorlage und ihr Autor so gut wie möglich nachgezeichnet sind, kann schließlich ihre Aussageabsicht diskutiert werden. Drei Aussagerichtungen schreibt man dem Epitomator zu, die sich in der Sekundärliteratur wiederum in unterschiedlicher Weise verbinden.

#### a) Hasmonäerkritik

Einmal entdeckt man in der Epitome eine versteckte Kritik an der Hasmonäerherrschaft<sup>(83)</sup>, denn:

<sup>(83)</sup> So bereits GEIGER, *Urschrift*, 219-220; aktuell vertreten diese Sichtweise etwa DORAN, *Propaganda*, 112; ENGEL, "Die Bücher der Makkabäer", 289; O. KAISER, *Die alttestamentlichen Apokryphen*. Eine Einleitung in Grundzügen (Gütersloh 2000) 24; NICKELSBURG, *Literature*, 110, 371; vgl. auch den gehaltvollen Vergleich zwischen 1 Makk und 2 Makk durch J.C.H. LEBRAM, "Jüdische Martyrologie und Weisheitsüberlieferung", *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (Hrsg. J.W. VAN HENTEN – B.A.G.M. DEHANDSCHUTTER – H.J.W. VAN DER KLAUW) (StPB 38; Leiden u.a. 1989) 88-126, hier 122-126.

- a. Der Epitomator stilisiert Judas als Gegenbild zu Johannes Hyrkan.
  - Gegenüber der militärischen Expansionspolitik Hyrkans stehen die auf Verteidigung beschränkten Kämpfe des Judas.
  - Nicht die Kriegskunst, sondern die in Gebeten erflachte und durch Bluteugnisse erwirkte Hilfe Gottes bewirkt den Sieg des Judas.
- b. Hyrkans Zugriff auf das Grab Davids rufe in Erinnerung, wie der Verräter Menelaus sich am Tempelschatz bedient habe.
- c. Die Hasmonäerdynastie kommt in 2 Makk schlecht weg:
  - Modein, der Stammsitz der Hasmonäer, wird in 13,14 lediglich als Lagerplatz für Judas' Streitmacht genannt.
  - Hyrkans Vater Simon erscheint in 10,19-22; 14,17 in einem schlechten Licht.
  - Eleasars Heldentat (1 Makk 6,43-46) schreibt 2 Makk 13,15 seinem Bruder Judas zu.

Die Indizien scheinen erdrückend. Aber sie beruhen vornehmlich auf *argumenta ex silentio*, Randthemen oder Divergenzen zwischen realen Hasmonäern und dem idealisierten Makkabäerbild des Epitomators, also recht schwachen Argumentationsformen. Wie so oft hat auch hier D. Arenhoevel richtig gesehen: Der Epitomator lässt sich "kaum zu einem Gegner der Makkabäer machen. Seine Begeisterung für Judas kennt keine Grenzen; das Zurücktreten der Brüder erklärt sich aus seiner Arbeitsweise. Vielmehr sagt er weder positiv noch negativ irgendein Wort zum Herrschaftsanspruch der Familie. Nicht einmal die genaue Stellung des Judas bestimmt er"<sup>(84)</sup>. Und das Frömmigkeitsideal des 2 Makk hätten die regierenden Hasmonäer wohl ohne Abstriche auch auf sich bezogen. Versteckte politische Polemik ist in dem Geschichtsauszug deshalb kaum auszumachen. Die Interessenlosigkeit der Epitome gegenüber der hasmonäischen Dynastie ist besser aus der räumlichen Distanz zu erklären.

#### b) Tempelpropaganda

Bei den meisten Auslegern gilt der Tempel als Hauptthema der Epitome<sup>(85)</sup>. Nach der Sicht vieler soll sie das Chanukkafest (und den

<sup>(84)</sup> ARENHÖVEL, *Theokratie*, 117; vgl. auch L.L. GRABBE, *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period. Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London – New York 2000) 59.

<sup>(85)</sup> Vgl. Titel und Untertitel von R. Dorans Untersuchung: "Temple Propaganda. The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees" und die Diskussion bei J. SIEVERS, *The Hasmoneans and their Supporters. From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I* (SFSHJ 6; Atlanta, GA 1990) 8-10. Zur forschung-

Nikanortag) legitimieren. Dafür lässt sich 10,5-8; 15,36 anführen. Wenn man die Epitome von den Einleitungsbriefen her liest, bestätigt sich diese Interpretation nochmals durch das Tempelweihfestthema (vgl. 1,8-9.18; 2,16). Von hier aus ist es nicht weit anzunehmen, der Auszug wolle bei den ägyptischen Juden für den Jerusalemer Tempel werben und sie (durch die gemeinsame Festpraxis) an das Zionsheiligtum binden. Ja, er könnte geradezu zur Abkehr vom jüdischen Konkurrenzheiligtum im ägyptischen Leontopolis anhalten. Doch zeigen 5,22-23 und 6,2, dass es nicht das Anliegen des Auszugs war, den Alleinvertretungsanspruch Jerusalems durchzusetzen<sup>(86)</sup>. Mit keinem Wort geht der Epitomator auf einen drohenden und abzuwendenden Abfall in Ägypten ein<sup>(87)</sup>. Diese Feststellung ist entscheidend, denn, wie bereits bemerkt, ist die Kurzfassung unabhängig von den Einleitungsbriefen entstanden und diachron für sich zu verstehen. Aus ihr selbst existiert aber kein Anhaltspunkt auf das Problem Leontopolis.

Die umrisshafte Rekonstruktion von Jasons Werk zeigte zudem, dass die Tempelthematik wahrscheinlich auf diese Schrift zurückgeht. Die Einsetzungsberichte der beiden Feste sind eher als Schlussbemerkungen zu den beiden Hauptteilen des Buches zu verstehen und als Rudimente aus dem Jasonwerk aufzufassen. Für den Epitomator hingegen ist der Tempel kein Selbstzweck, sondern lediglich ein Gradmesser für den Heilsstand des Gottesvolkes: "Deshalb nahm auch der Ort, so wie er jetzt an den Schicksalsschlägen des Volkes Anteil hatte, hernach an den Wohltaten teil. Und der im Zorn des Allbeherrschers verlassene Ort wurde in der Versöhnung des großen Herrn mit aller Pracht wiederhergestellt" (5,20). Denn 5,19 formuliert das Prinzip, "der Herr erwählte nicht wegen des Ortes das Volk, sondern wegen des Volkes den Ort". Das Jerusalemer Heiligtum spielt in 2 Makk eine wichtige Rolle; aber nicht an sich, sondern in dienender Funktion: einerseits (anabatisch) als Ort der Toraerfüllung und zweitens (katabatisch) als Indikator des Heilszustandes. Die Tempeltheologie ist somit nicht das eigentliche Anliegen des Epitomators.

Auch E. Haag, der eine enge Verbindung zwischen Auszug und Einleitungsbriefen (vor allem dem ersten) annimmt, lehnt einen Bezug

---

s-geschichtlichen Entwicklung dieser Erklärung vgl. ARENHÖVEL, *Theokratie*, 99-100.

<sup>(86)</sup> Vgl. ZSENGELLÉR, "Maccabees", 184-187.

<sup>(87)</sup> ARENHÖVEL, *Theokratie*, 101; vgl. DORAN, *Propaganda*, 11-12.

auf das Leontopolis-Heiligtum ab<sup>(88)</sup>. Er macht stattdessen einen durch alle Buchteile gehenden paränetischen Grundzug mit theokratischem Ideal aus. Er schreitet damit in der von D. Arenhoevel eingeschlagenen Richtung voran. Durch sein konzentrisches Strukturmodell mit 8,1–10,9 als Kulminationspunkt<sup>(89)</sup> spielt bei ihm jedoch die Märtyrertheologie von 2 Makk keine große Rolle. Gerade sie ist aber im Folgenden zu bedenken.

### c) Märtyrertheologie

Schon lange ist die der Epitome eigene Dynamik, die von innerjüdischer Harmonie über Glaubensabfall, Bedrängnis, Glaubenszeugnis bis hin zur Rettung und neuer Festigung reicht, beobachtet worden<sup>(90)</sup> — die Analyse des Aufbaus von 2 Makk hat dies bereits zu Tage gefördert. Am detailliertesten hat diese (zumindest) doppelte Bewegung J.W. van Henten herausgearbeitet<sup>(91)</sup>. Deutlich erwirken dabei die Blutzzeugnisse der Glaubensbekenner die Wende von der Not zum Heil<sup>(92)</sup>. An diesem Grundzug ist nach meinem Dafürhalten bei der Gesamtinterpretation der Epitome nicht vorbei zu kommen. Denn wenn die formale Struktur eines Textes, wovon ich überzeugt bin, einen Schlüssel zu seinem Verständnis bereithält, dann ist sie bei der Interpretation von 2 Makk unverzichtbar und vorentscheidend. Die Vorstellung, der Hinwendung zu Gott komme Heilsbedeutung für die gesamte jüdische Kommunität zu, durchzieht den gesamten Auszug — das hat J.W. van Henten hinreichend aufgezeigt. Denn einerseits sind die Blutzzeugnisse Voraussetzung für die Siege, die die Makkabäer erringen. Umgekehrt gehen den militärischen Erfolgen von Judas regelmäßig die Gebete der makkabäischen Kämpfer und die göttliche Hilfe aufgrund ihrer Gesetzestreue voraus. Und wie die Märtyrer stehen sie für ihren Glauben mit dem Einsatz ihres Lebens ein. Märtyrer- und Aufstandstheologie konvergieren also in 2 Makk. „Eigentlich kämpfen beide, Märtyrer und Soldaten, für dieselbe Sache“<sup>(93)</sup>. In

<sup>(88)</sup> HAAG, *Zeitalter*, 155-156; HAAG, „Theokratie“, 91-92.

<sup>(89)</sup> HAAG, *Zeitalter*, 152-153 — vgl. oben 3.

<sup>(90)</sup> Vgl. etwa schon ABEL, *livres*, XLIV.

<sup>(91)</sup> Vgl. Anm. 30.

<sup>(92)</sup> B. HERR, „Ist Gott blutrünstig? Die Theologie der Stellvertretung im Zweiten Makkabäerbuch“, MThZ, im Druck; vgl. auch J.W. VAN HENTEN, „Jewish Martyrdom and Jesus' Death“, *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament* (Hrsg. J. FREY – J. SCHRÖTER) (Tübingen 2007) 139-168, hier 148-151.

<sup>(93)</sup> VAN HENTEN, „Selbstverständnis“, 145.



unüberbietbarer Dichte bringen 15,26-27 dieses Denken auf eine Formel: „Aber die um Judas stießen unter Anrufung und Gebeten mit den Feinden zusammen. Mit den Händen kämpfend, mit den Herzen aber zu Gott betend, streckten sie nicht weniger als 35000 nieder, übergücklich über das Sichtbarwerden Gottes“.

Doch selbst J.W. van Henten, der diese Theologie von 2 Makk so detailliert ausgearbeitet hat, bleibt den althergebrachten Verständnisweisen des Buches verhaftet. Einerseits konstatiert er eine antihasmoneische Tendenz in der Schrift<sup>(94)</sup>, vor allem aber versteht er die Epitome „as explanation“<sup>(95)</sup> der in den Einleitungsbriefen vorgenommenen Einladung an die ägyptischen Juden zum Mitvollzug des Chanukkafestes. Scheinbar wirkt sich seine Einzelanalyse der Epitome nicht auf das Gesamtverständnis des Buches aus; beides bleibt unverbunden nebeneinander stehen<sup>(96)</sup>. Für mich liegt hier das frappierendste Beispiel für das Beharrungsvermögen eigentlich überholter Erklärungsmuster, welches für die Forschungsgeschichte von 2 Makk so bezeichnend ist. Das Erklärungsmodell der Märtyrertheologie hätte sich viel tiefgreifender auf das Verständnis von 2 Makk auswirken können.

#### 8. Die Endkomposition von 2 Makk

Kirchlicherseits wurde die Epitome in Einheit mit den Eingangsbriefen rezipiert – dies belegt schon allein die Kapiteleinteilung 2 Makk 1;2, die die Vorrede des Epitomators mit den Briefen zusammenbindet. Tatsächlich findet sich im Buch selbst ein Anzeichen für einen herausgeberischen Eingriff, der zumindest den ersten Brief mit der Kurzfassung verbindet. Die Klammer liegt in dem Verb *katallassein* vor. Denn wie R. Doran bemerkt, taucht das Wort in der gesamten Septuaginta nur in 2 Makk 1,5; 7,33; 8,29 und in Jer 31,39 auf, in der Jeremiastelle jedoch in abweichender Bedeutung<sup>(97)</sup>.

<sup>(94)</sup> VAN HENTEN, *Martyrs*, 54, 302-303.

<sup>(95)</sup> VAN HENTEN, *Martyrs*, 57.

<sup>(96)</sup> Das dürfte damit zu tun haben, dass für J.W. van Henten 2 Makk insgesamt und die Märtyrerpassagen im Besonderen vorrangig politische Aussagen treffen – vgl. J.W. VAN HENTEN, „Die Märtyrer als Helden des Volkes“, *Jüdische Schriften in ihrem antik-jüdischen und urchristlichen Kontext* (Hrsg. H. LICHTENBERGER – O.S. OEGEMA) (Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 1; Gütersloh 2002) 102-133; VAN HENTEN, „2 Maccabees“, 79-82, 85-86.

<sup>(97)</sup> DORAN, *Propaganda*, 5.

2 Makk 5,20 bietet nochmals das Substantiv desselben Wortstamms. Mit dem Stichwort des "Versöhnens" schlagen 5,20; 7,33; 8,29 das Hauptthema der Epitome an. Denn die Versöhnung Gottes mit seinem Volk ist nach Glaubensabfall, Niedergang und Glaubenszeugnis wiederholt das Ziel der Kurzfassung. Dieselbe theologische Haltung vertritt auch der erste Einleitungsbrief<sup>(98)</sup>: Seine Adressaten befinden sich augenscheinlich in einer Notsituation, die der Verfasser auf die Abkehr Gottes zurückführt (V. 5). Sie sollen nun die erneute Hinwendung Gottes erwirken, indem sie zur Orthopraxie zurückkehren (Vv. 2-5). Unausgesprochen ist damit als Ursprung des Übels ein Ablassen von der rechten Gottesverehrung vorausgesetzt. Vv. 7-8 illustrieren diese Theologie mit einem historischen Rekurs: dem Glaubensabfall Jasons und seiner Anhängerschaft, der Frömmigkeit der Makkabäer, ihrer Erhörung und ihrem weiteren Engagement für den Gottesdienst. So nimmt der erste Eingangsbrief das theologische Anliegen der Epitome durchaus vorweg, und der terminologische Brückenschlag über das Schlagwort "versöhnen" zeigt dieses Zusammenspiel als gewollt an.

Wann wurde diese Bezugnahme vorgenommen? Die Unterschiede zwischen Auszug und erstem Brief raten davon ab, die Zusammenstellung dem Epitomator selbst zuzuschreiben. Vermutlich geht die terminologische Klammer auf den Kompositeur zurück, welcher die Briefe der Epitome vorschaltete. Möglicherweise nutzte er die Gelegenheit, die semitischen Schreiben ins Griechische zu übertragen, um den Vorverweis in V. 5 einzubauen. Wie sich die Zusammenfügung auch immer historisch abgespielt haben mag, synchron erscheint 2 Makk in jedem Fall als ein soteriologisches Buch, in dem der Tempel nur eine vordergründige Rolle spielt. Kurioserweise bewahrheitet so die diachrone Betrachtung die lange gepflegte endtextliche Leseweise von 2 Makk; aber sie bestätigt nicht die Tempeltheologie als Hauptthema des Gesamtwerks. Die theologische Klammer von 2 Makk besteht vielmehr in der Bekenntnistheologie von 1,1-10a und 2,19-15,39.

#### 9. *Fazit: Die Priorität des soteriologischen Gerüsts vor den tempeltheologischen Einsprengeln*

Der Perspektivenwechsel (vom Einheits- zum Trennungsmodell) bei der Erforschung des Zweiten Makkabäerbuches bewirkt ein neues

<sup>(98)</sup> Vgl. BICKERMANN, "Festbrief", 252-253.

Gesamtverständnis des Buches. Denn die gesonderte Betrachtung von Einleitungsbriefen und Epitome und die konsequente Untersuchung des Aufbaus des Geschichtsauszugs führt zu einer klar soteriologischen Deutung des Werkes. Bislang hat man zu oft vor lauter tempeltheologischen Bäumen den soteriologischen Wald nicht gesehen. War das Buch bislang vorwiegend von religionshistorischem Interesse (als Zeugnis jüdischer Tempeltheologie oder als Beleg für das Verhältnis des Judentums im Mutterland zur Diaspora), so nimmt nun seine theologische Relevanz zu. Diachron gewannen das Werk des Jason sowie die Intention des Epitomators an Schärfe: Jasons Opus präsentiert sich als materialreiche Historie (vgl. 2,24) mit besonderem Interesse am Jerusalemer Tempel (vgl. 2,19.22), der Epitomator entpuppt sich als pastoral orientierter Theologe (vgl. 2,25 und auch 15,39), der zum Festhalten am Glauben gerade in der Not mahnt. Methodisch zeigte sich, wie sehr neue Einzelergebnisse für die Gesamtinterpretation von Bedeutung sind. Das hat die bisherige Forschung an 2 Makk meistens zu wenig berücksichtigt und trotz Fortschritten in Einzelfragen (wie zum Aufbau der Epitome oder zur Abgrenzung der Eingangsbriefe) die traditionelle Gesamtsicht des Buches unverändert prolongiert. Zugleich eröffnet der Perspektivenwechsel neue Fragehorizonte, etwa nach den genaueren Umständen, in denen sich Adressaten und Verfasser befanden, oder nach der Urform der Einleitungsbriefe und dem Prozess ihrer Angliederung an die Epitome.

Pastor-Giesen-Str. 17  
D-50354 Hürth

Bertram HERR

#### SUMMARY

According to a widespread opinion the purpose of the Second Book of Maccabees is to emphasize the great importance of the temple. This is plausible to a certain extent if the summary of history is read together with the two introductory letters. But those authors are right who consider the letters to be originally independent of each other and also of the abridged version. The construction of the summary taken in itself reveals a soteriology which attributes an important part to the witness of faith for the history of salvation, especially when bloodshed is involved. With regard to this point the abridged version and the first introductory letter harmonize. Both the summary and the work as a whole have therefore a soteriological orientation and stress the witness of faith as relevant for salvation.

# ANIMADVERSIONES

## Two Types of Argumentation Involving Rhetorical Questions in Biblical Hebrew Dialogue<sup>(1)</sup>

Rhetorical questions in Biblical Hebrew have received a fair amount of attention in the scholarly literature. Rhetorical questions (henceforth RQs) serve a variety of discourse functions in Biblical dialogue, including, among other uses, the expression of a premise in a logical argument. The use of RQs in arguments has been widely noted by Biblical scholars, and a number of characteristic linguistic forms used to express the arguments have been studied in detail. The modes of reasoning underlying the arguments, however, have not received sufficient attention. The present study investigates the types of argumentation expressed by RQs in Biblical Hebrew, based on a systematic examination of the prose dialogue in Genesis through Kings. The majority of the arguments were found to have one of two forms: *modus tollens* (also known as denying the consequent), and denying the antecedent<sup>(2)</sup>. Given the conditional, “If P then Q”, where P is the antecedent and Q the consequent, *modus tollens* arguments seek to demonstrate the falsity of P by means of denying Q, while arguments which deny the antecedent seek to demonstrate the falsity of Q by means of denying P. *Modus tollens* is a deductively valid mode of argumentation, while denying the antecedent is formally invalid. The two types of arguments are examined in the light of pragmatic argumentation theory. It is shown that despite the significant differences between *modus tollens* and denying the antecedent, the two types have similar linguistic representations and can be used to similar effect in conversational discourse.

### 1. Rhetorical questions in the scholarly literature

RQs are questions on the semantic level, defining a set of possible answers, and are formally classified as interrogative. In contrast to the genuine question, a RQ is not a request for information, but an implicit assertion<sup>(3)</sup>. RQs occur in contexts in which the speaker believes that the

(1) An earlier version of this paper was delivered at the Joint Conference of the Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Hebrew Language Departments of the Israeli Universities, Haifa University, July 14, 2007. I am grateful to Richard Steiner and Ed Greenstein for helpful discussions of rhetorical questions in the Bible and for bringing several references to my attention. I would like to thank Mark Steiner for his helpful comments on a draft of this article.

(2) *Modus tollens* is short for *modus tollendo tollens*, “the mode that denies by denying”. A number of other modes of argumentation were also identified but are not analyzed in detail in this paper; see n. 44.

(3) See, e.g., C. ILIE, *What Else Can I Tell You? A Pragmatic Study of English Rhetorical Questions as Discursive and Argumentative Acts* (Stockholm Studies in

implicated assertion is obvious<sup>(4)</sup>. This assertion may be one that is accepted by both speaker and addressee, or one that the speaker is trying to persuade the hearer to accept<sup>(5)</sup>. Both yes-no and content ("wh") questions may be RQs. The answer to a yes-no RQ has a polarity opposite to that of the question: affirmative questions imply negative answers and negative questions imply affirmative answers. Thus "Are you the president?" implies "You are not the president"<sup>(6)</sup>. The answer to a content RQ is usually a noun phrase or adverb denoting the null set, such as "nothing" or "no one"<sup>(7)</sup>; e.g., the RQ "What can I possibly do for you?" implies "I can do nothing for you." In a different type of content RQ the answer is not the null set, but a particular referent that the speaker has in mind. The speaker may supply this value immediately following the rhetorical question, e.g., "Who loves you more than anyone else? Why, your mother, of course"<sup>(8)</sup>.

Many studies of RQs in Biblical Hebrew focus on the use of RQs in poetry, and particularly in wisdom literature<sup>(9)</sup>. The Biblical RQ can be used to make a strong statement; on the other hand, it is sometimes a

---

English 82; Stockholm 1994) 38.45; J. SCHMIDT-RADEFELDT, "On So-called 'Rhetorical' Questions", *Journal of Pragmatics* 1 (1977) 376-377.

(<sup>4</sup>) See, e.g., R. QUIRK et al., *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (London 1985) 1478; J.M. SADOCK – A.M. ZWICKY, "Speech Act Distinctions in Syntax", *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* (ed. T. SHOPEN) (Cambridge 1985) I, 180.

(<sup>5</sup>) On the use of rhetorical questions in persuasive contexts, see, e.g., G.I. ANZILOTTI, "The Rhetorical Question as an Indirect Speech Device in English and Italian", *Canadian Modern Language Review* 38 (1982) 290-302; C. ENE, "Rhetorical Questions within the Theory of Speech Acts", *Cahiers de linguistique theorique et appliquee*, 20 (1983) 36; J. FRANK, "You Call That a Rhetorical Question? Forms and Functions of Rhetorical Questions in Conversation", *Journal of Pragmatics* 14 (1990) 723-738.

(<sup>6</sup>) Polarity reversal is a characteristic trait of RQs; see, e.g., E.N. POPE, "Questions and Answers in English" (Ph. D. diss., MIT 1972; repr. *Janua Linguarum Series Practica* 226; The Hague 1976) 46-47; QUIRK et al., *Comprehensive Grammar*, 825. There is a special kind of RQ in English whose answer does not have reversed polarity, e.g., "Is the Pope Catholic?" This type of RQ is used as a retort and implies that the answer to the RQ (i.e., "yes"/"no") is the answer to the preceding question as well; see D. SCHAFER, "Can Rhetorical Questions Function as Retorts? Is the Pope Catholic?", *Journal of Pragmatics* 37 (2005) 433-460. On the question of whether some RQs in BH do not have reversed polarity, see section 3, below, and particularly n. 35.

(<sup>7</sup>) POPE, "Questions and Answers", 59.

(<sup>8</sup>) *Ibid.*, 59.

(<sup>9</sup>) On the RQ in poetry, see, e.g., R.G. KOOPS, "Rhetorical Questions and Implied Meaning in the Book of Job", *BT* 39 (1988) 415-423; L.J. DE REGT, "Discourse Implications of Rhetorical Questions in Job, Deuteronomy and the Minor Prophets", *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible* (ed. L.J. DE REGT et al.) (Winona Lake, IN 1996) 51-78; J.F.J. VAN RENSBURG, "Wise Men Saying Things by Asking Questions: The Function of the Interrogative in Job 3 to 14", *Old Testament Essays* 4 (1991) 227-247. On the characteristic use of RQs in wisdom literature, see, e.g., J.L. CRENSHAW, "Impossible Questions, Sayings, and Tasks", *Semeia* 17 (1980) 19-34; T.R. HOBBS, "Jeremiah 3:1-5 and Deuteronomy 24:1-4", *ZAW* 86 (1974) 25; G.S. ODGEN, "Qoheleth's Use of the 'Nothing is Better'-Form", *JBL* 98 (1979) 342. An in-depth investigation of RQs in Ecclesiastes is R.E. JOHNSON, "The Rhetorical Question as a Literary Device in Ecclesiastes" (Ph. D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary 1986). Although Johnson's main focus is Ecclesiastes, he also examines the use of the RQ in general in BH, describing its function on four levels: grammatical/syntactic, disputational, literary, and psychological.

courteous means of issuing a corrective or criticism<sup>(10)</sup>. It can be used as a persuasive device: the speaker attempts to convince the hearer to accept the implied answer to the question by implying that the answer is obvious<sup>(11)</sup>. RQs express a variety of emotions, including supplication, joy, wonder, indignation, reproach, irony and sarcasm, among others<sup>(12)</sup>. On the literary level, the RQ plays a structuring role in poetic texts, both opening and closing sections<sup>(13)</sup>.

Several scholars have discussed the use of RQs to express the premise upon which a conclusion is based (henceforth "argumentative RQs"). The RQ is said to establish a consensus, or common ground between speaker and addressee, which is then used to advance the argument<sup>(14)</sup>. Two characteristic linguistic structures associated with argumentative RQs have been studied. In one structure a RQ is followed by a **כִּי** or **אֲשֶׁר** clause<sup>(15)</sup>. Van Selms terms this a "motivated interrogative sentence"<sup>(16)</sup>. Coats analyzes a subtype of this structure which contains a RQ of the form **X מִי/מַה** "who/what is X", e.g., Exod 3,11 **מִי אֲנִי כִי אֵלךְ אֶל פַּרְעֹה** "Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh?" According to Coats this structure represents a stereotyped insult/self-abasement formula<sup>(17)</sup>. Coats states that the RQ serves as the basis for the conclusion, which is the negation of the proposition expressed by the **כִּי** clause, i.e., "I should not go to Pharaoh." Steiner notes that in addition to its use in deprecatory questions, the **...כִּי...** formula is often used "to ask — indignantly and sometimes rhetorically —

<sup>(10)</sup> On the use of RQs to emphasize a statement, see, e.g., CRENSHAW, "Impossible Questions", 23; JOHNSON, "Rhetorical Question", 87; RENSBERG, "Wise Men", 245. On their use as a politeness device, see, e.g., R.T. HYMAN, "Questions and the Book of Ruth", *Hebrew Studies* 24 (1983) 17-25. Scholars have noticed the same duality in the function of RQs in English; Ilie writes that RQs "can act as *amplifiers* or as *mitigators*" (ILIE, *What Else Can I Tell You*, 128, emphasis in the original).

<sup>(11)</sup> See, e.g., DE REGT, "Discourse Implications", 52.

<sup>(12)</sup> The emotions expressed by RQs are examined in T.E. PRATT, "The Meaning of the Interrogative in the Old Testament" (Ph.D. diss., Baylor University 1972) 120-151.

<sup>(13)</sup> See, e.g., JOHNSON, "Rhetorical Question", 106; DE REGT, "Discourse Implications", 64-73; YELLIN, "Selected Writings" (Jerusalem 1936-1939) II, 3-4 (Hebr.).

<sup>(14)</sup> The argumentative use of RQs in English is discussed in ILIE, *What Else Can I Tell You*, chapters 6 and 7. According to Ilie RQs can express either a premise or the conclusion of an argument. Ilie mentions *modus ponens* (affirming the antecedent) and *modus tollens* as two types of logical arguments expressed by RQs. On argumentative RQs in the Bible, see, e.g., W. BRUEGGEMANN, "Jeremiah's Use of Rhetorical Questions", *JBL* 92 (1973) 358-374; CRENSHAW, "Impossible Questions", 23-28; HOBBS, "Jeremiah", 25; HYMAN, "Questions", 20-21; JOHNSON, "Rhetorical Question", 99.

<sup>(15)</sup> The **כִּי/אֲשֶׁר** clause in this formula is termed a "consequential" clause (A.B. DAVIDSON, *Hebrew Syntax* [3d ed.; Edinburgh 1901] §150) or a "consecutive" clause (GKC §166). Steiner notes that consequential **כִּי** occurs in genuine as well as rhetorical questions and can even occur in declarative sentences, e.g., Gen 40,15 (R.C. STEINER, "On the Original Structure and Meaning of *Mah Nishtannah* and the History of its Reinterpretation", *Jewish Studies*. An Internet Journal 7 [2008] 16-17).

<sup>(16)</sup> A. VAN SELMS, "Motivated Interrogative Sentences in Biblical Hebrew", *Semitics* 2 (1971-72) 143-149; A. VAN SELMS, "Motivated Interrogative Sentences in the Book of Job", *Semitics* 6 (1978) 28-35.

<sup>(17)</sup> On the uses of this formula and its parallels in the Amarna letters and Lachish letters see G.W. COATS, Jr., "Self-abasement and Insult Formulas", *JBL* 89 (1970) 14-26; see also O. SCHWARZWALD, "Linguistic Phenomena and their Reflection in the Syntax of Interrogative Pronoun **מִי** in Biblical Hebrew", *Beit Mikra* 24 (1978) 86 (Hebr.).

what an aggrieved party did to deserve shabby treatment”, as in Gen 31,36 מה פשעי מה חטאתי כי דלקת אחרי “What is my crime, what is my guilt that you have pursued me?”<sup>(18)</sup>

In a second structure involving argumentative RQs, the conclusion is expressed by a “why” RQ. In the “triple rhetorical question” formula a double yes-no question expressing the premise is accompanied by a “why” RQ expressing the conclusion, e.g., Jer 2,14 העבד ישראל אם יליד בית הוא מדוע “Is Israel a bondman? Is he a home-born slave? Why is he given over to plunder?”<sup>(19)</sup> This formula is said to be restricted to poetry and elevated prose, and is particularly characteristic of Jeremiah. There is a striking similarity in meaning between the triple rhetorical question and the yes-no question followed by a כי clause. In a few cases a double yes-no RQ is followed by כי rather than a “why” question (e.g., Job 7,12; Jer 31,19)<sup>(20)</sup>.

Much less attention has been paid to the logical structure underlying arguments with RQs. Two scholars who do address the issue are van Selms and Herzog (the latter cited by Greenstein.) According to van Selms many motivated interrogative sentences can be understood as a sort of *reductio ad absurdum* argument against the proposition expressed by the כי clause<sup>(21)</sup>. A typical example is 1 Sam 17,43 הכלב אנכי כי אתה בא אלי במקלות “Am I a dog, that you come at me with sticks?” Van Selms explains the argument as follows: “From the fact that David approached Goliath with his shepherd’s equipment it would almost have followed that Goliath was a dog. But he is not, and so David should not have come to him with sticks”<sup>(22)</sup>. Van Selms notes that such an analysis can be applied to some triple rhetorical questions as well<sup>(23)</sup>. Van Selms’ view is discussed further in section 5, below. Greenstein, citing Herzog, states that triple rhetorical questions often involve a syllogistic-like argument, in which one of the premises is implicit<sup>(24)</sup>. As I will show in the sections below, recognizing the implicit

<sup>(18)</sup> STEINER, “*Mah Nishtannah*”, 16-17 shows that Biblical ...כי... later gives rise to Tannaitic ...מה נשתנה...ש, and points to ...מה...ש in Cant 5,9 as the possible “direct ancestor” of the Tannaitic formula.

<sup>(19)</sup> On the triple rhetorical question and its Ugaritic parallels, see, e.g., Y. AVISHUR, “Double and Triple Question Patterns in the Bible and Ugaritic”, *Zer Li’gevurot*. The Zalman Shazar Jubilee Volume. A Collection of Studies in Bible, Eretz Yisrael, Hebrew Language and Talmudic Literature (ed. B.Z. LURIA) (Jerusalem 1973) 421-464 (Hebr.); BRUEGGEMANN, “Jeremiah”, 358-374; H.L. GINSBERG, “The Legend of King Keret: A Canaanite Epic of the Bronze Age”, *BASOR.S* 2-3 (1946) 35; M. HELD, “Rhetorical Questions in Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew”, *Eretz Israel* 9 (1969) 71-79; A.D. SINGER, “On a Certain Type of Interrogative Sentence in Biblical Hebrew”, *World Congress of Jewish Studies Summer 1947* (Jerusalem 1952) I, 109-112 (Hebr.).

<sup>(20)</sup> Held suggests that כי can have the same meaning as מדוע (HELD, “Rhetorical Questions”, 79), while van Selms views the “why” question simply as a different form of a motivating clause (“Motivated Interrogative Sentences in the Book of Job”, 29.) On this point see also A. AEJMELAUS, “Function and Interpretation of כי in Biblical Hebrew”, *JBL* 105 (1986) 201.

<sup>(21)</sup> VAN SELMS, “Motivated Interrogative Sentences in Biblical Hebrew”; VAN SELMS, “Motivated Interrogative Sentences in the Book of Job.”

<sup>(22)</sup> VAN SELMS, “Motivated Interrogative Sentences in Biblical Hebrew”, 145.

<sup>(23)</sup> VAN SELMS, “Motivated Interrogative Sentences in the Book of Job”, 29.

<sup>(24)</sup> E. GREENSTEIN, “Some Developments in the Study of Language and Some Implications for Interpreting Ancient Texts and Cultures”, *Semitic Linguistics. The State of the Art at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century* (ed. S. IZRE’EL) (Israel Oriental Studies

premise or premises is critical for the proper understanding of argumentative RQs.

## 2. *Pragmatic argumentation theory*

The modern study of argumentation includes a variety of theoretical viewpoints. The school of thought most useful for our purposes can be termed pragmatic argumentation theory, and is prominently associated with the pragma-dialectical theory developed by van Eemeren and Grootendorst, as well as with the related, but distinct approach of Douglas Walton<sup>(25)</sup>. Van Eemeren and Grootendorst utilize an idealized model of argumentation, in which the main goal of the participants is to resolve a critical difference of opinion, and arguments are judged by a universalized set of rules. Pragma-dialectic theory stresses the importance of the pragmatics of language use in understanding arguments. A relevant pragmatic phenomenon is the use of indirect speech acts to express premises or conclusions. Van Eemeren et al. cite the use of the RQ as an indirect assertion expressing a premise, a usage closely resembling the argumentative RQ in the Bible: "Let's take an umbrella, or do you want to get wet?"<sup>(26)</sup> The rhetorical question "Do you want to get wet" serves as an indirect assertion, "We do not want to get wet"; this in turn is a premise supporting the conclusion, "We should take an umbrella."

I have found Douglas Walton's approach, which takes a context-based approach to argument evaluation, to be the most useful for investigating Biblical argumentation. Walton defines an argument as the use of reasoning in a dialogue to achieve a particular goal in the context of the discourse. Possible goals include, but are not restricted to resolving a difference of opinion<sup>(27)</sup>. According to Walton proper interpretation and evaluation of an argument depends on the goal of the argument<sup>(28)</sup>. In judging an argument as correct one must consider not only its logical properties but also the

---

20; Winona Lake, IN 2002) 452-453. I was unfortunately unable to obtain Herzog's dissertation (E. HERZOG, "The Triple Rhetorical Argument in the Latter Prophets", Ph. D. diss., Jewish Theological Seminary 1991).

<sup>(25)</sup> On pragma-dialectic argumentation theory see, e.g., F.H. VAN EEMEREN et al., eds., *Fundamentals of Argumentation Theory*. A Handbook of Historical Backgrounds and Contemporary Developments (Mahwah, NJ 1996); F.H. VAN EEMEREN – R. GROOTENDORST, *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions*. A Theoretical Model for the Analysis of Discussions Directed towards Solving Conflicts of Opinion (Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis 1; Dordrecht 1984); F.H. VAN EEMEREN – R. GROOTENDORST, *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation*. The Pragma-dialectical Approach (Cambridge 2004). WALTON is a prolific writer on argumentation theory; relevant works include, e.g., *Argument Structure*. A Pragmatic Theory (Toronto 1996); *Argumentation Schemes for Presumptive Reasoning* (LEA Titles in Argumentation; Mahwah, NJ 1996); *The New Dialectic*. Conversational Contexts of Argument (Toronto 1998); "The New Dialectic: A Method of Evaluating an Argument Used for Some Purpose in a Given Case", *ProtoSociology* 13 (1999) 70-91.

<sup>(26)</sup> VAN EEMEREN et al., *Fundamentals of Argumentation Theory*, 13-14.

<sup>(27)</sup> WALTON, "New Dialectic", 74. Other goals mentioned by WALTON include, e.g., seeking information, negotiating a deal, intellectual inquiry, and deliberation regarding possible courses of action.

<sup>(28)</sup> WALTON, *New Dialectic*, 30; "New Dialectic", 88.



speaker's intentions in making the argument. Arguments may also be judged from the perspective of effectiveness. An argument is effective, or successful, if it achieves its goal.

An important point made by Walton is that arguments in natural dialogue are often not intended to be logically valid. In a valid argument, the truth of the conclusion follows from the truth of the premises. An example is the syllogism "All A's are B. X is an A. Therefore, X is B." If the first two premises are true, then it is also true that X is B. Many arguments in everyday conversation, in contrast, are "presumptive", shifting the burden of proof to the addressee to show that the conclusion is *not* true<sup>(29)</sup>. Walton argues that some logically invalid arguments can be effectively used as presumptive rather than deductive arguments<sup>(30)</sup>. Walton's views are directly relevant to understanding the Biblical use of RQs in argumentation, as shown below.

### 3. The data for the study

The corpus for the study is the prose portions of Genesis through Kings<sup>(31)</sup>. The questions in the corpus were located by means of computerized searches for the various interrogative particles<sup>(32)</sup>.

Clauses with הלא were omitted due to the difficulty in distinguishing questions with the interrogative-negative combination הלא from affirmative assertions with the homonymous clausal adverb הלא<sup>(33)</sup>. Unmarked yes-no questions were excluded as well, due to the impossibility of finding these by

(29) See, e.g., WALTON, *Argument Structure*, 240, 245; WALTON, *The New Dialectic*, 41.

(30) D. WALTON, *Informal Fallacies*. Towards a Theory of Argument Criticisms (Pragmatics & Beyond 4; Amsterdam 1987) 3-4; D. WALTON, *Argumentation Schemes*.

(31) The text for the study is the MT, as represented in BHS. I follow BHS in categorizing passages as prose or poetry. Translations are my own, based primarily on NJPS and NRSV.

(32) Clauses containing the formally identical exclamatory particles (i.e., מה, איך) were excluded from the results of the search. There are clear syntactic differences between the homonymous interrogative and exclamatory particles, as pointed out by STEINER, "Mah Nishtanna", 16-17; for example, מה in exclamations functions as an adverb of degree (e.g., Num 24,5 מה מבו "how beautiful"), while מה in questions is most frequently a pronoun (e.g., 1 Sam 20,1 מה עשית "what did I do") or an adverb of manner (e.g., Gen 44,16 מה נצטרך "how can we prove our innocence?"). On the relation between RQs and exclamations, see below.

(33) On the clausal adverb הלא see J. BLAU, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Porta Linguarum Orientalium Neue Serie 12; Wiesbaden 1993) §103.3; M.L. BROWN, "Is it Not?" or 'Indeed!': HL in Northwest Semitic", *Maarav* 4 (1987) 201-219; A. MOSHAVI, "Syntactic Evidence for a Clausal Adverb הלא in Biblical Hebrew", *JNSL* 33 (2007) 51-63; D. SIVAN – W. SCHNIEDEWIND, "Letting Your 'Yes' Be 'No' in Ancient Israel: A Study of the Asseverative לא and הלא", *JSS* 38 (1993) 209-226; R.C. STEINER, review of J. BLAU, *An Adverbial Construction in Hebrew and Arabic*. Sentence Adverbials in Frontal Position Separated from the Rest of the Sentence, *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 6 (1979) 147-149. Since any negative RQ can be reformulated as an assertion consisting of the affirmative implication of the question, it is generally impossible to prove that a הלא clause is a negative RQ as opposed to an assertion with the clausal adverb; thus there is no way to know whether הלא דברתי אליך לאמר (Num 23,26) is "Didn't I tell you", or "I told you!" Note that the opposite is not the case; there are many cases in which syntactic and/or pragmatic criteria suffice to demonstrate that הלא must represent the clausal

means of computer searches, as well as the exegetical uncertainty regarding some of the cited examples of this phenomenon<sup>(34)</sup>.

Yes-no questions were identified as rhetorical if they serve as implicit assertions with a polarity opposite to that of the question. Although there is a group of unanswered yes-no questions in BH with non-reversed polarity, most of these are probably not RQs, but conducive questions<sup>(35)</sup>. In the conducive question the speaker has a prior belief or expectation regarding the answer to the question, e.g., "Is that you, Henry?"<sup>(36)</sup> Some conducive questions do not expect an answer, potentially blurring the distinction between conducive and rhetorical questions<sup>(37)</sup>. Closer inspection, however, reveals important difference between the two types. Unlike RQs, conducive questions do not serve as implicit assertions, nor are their answers obvious<sup>(38)</sup>. More strikingly, the expected answer to an affirmative conducive question often does not have reversed polarity; thus the expected answer to the affirmative "Is that you, Henry?" is "Yes."

It should be noted that the RQ, as defined here, is clearly distinguished from the exclamation on semantic and pragmatic grounds, notwithstanding Joüon-Muraoka's (§162a) comment that "the line between question and exclamation is often ill-defined." RQs are semantically questions, defining a

adverb; on this see MOSHAVI, "Syntactic Evidence"; A. MOSHAVI, "Rhetorical Question or Assertion? The Pragmatics of שאל in Biblical Hebrew", *JANES* 32 (forthcoming).

<sup>(34)</sup> On unmarked questions, see, e.g., A.B. DAVIDSON, *Hebrew Syntax* (Edinburgh 1901) §121a; GKC §150a; H.G. MITCHELL, "The Omission of the Interrogative Particle", *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper* (ed. R. HARPER et al.) (Chicago, IL 1908) 115-129; A. SPERBER, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. A Presentation of Problems with Suggestions to their Solution (Leiden 1966). The questions listed in the above references contain a fair number of RQs, but only a few of these express logical arguments, i.e., Exod 8,22; 1 Sam 21,16; 22,7. On ambiguities involved in some purported examples of unmarked questions, see B. KEDAR, "The Interpretation of Rhetorical Questions", *"Sha'arei Talmon"*. Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon (ed. M. FISHBANE – E. TOV – W.W. FIELDS) (Winona Lake, IN 1992) 146-148 (Hebr. section).

<sup>(35)</sup> On purportedly rhetorical questions with non-reversed polarity, see, e.g., R. GORDIS, "A Rhetorical Use of Interrogative Sentences in Biblical Hebrew", *AJSL* 49 (1933) 212-217; KEDAR, "Interpretation of Rhetorical Questions", 149; DE REGT, "Discourse Implications", 60-64. The questions cited in these sources bear no functional resemblance to the RQ-as-retort (see n. 6, above), which is the only kind of yes-no RQ I am aware of that has non-reversed polarity. Most of the questions cited, such as the הלא ראי 'have you seen' formula (e.g., 1 Sam 10,24) are really conducive. One well-known example, Jer 31,19, is indeed rhetorical, but may have reversed polarity; see, e.g., VAN SELMS, "Motivated Interrogative Sentences in Biblical Hebrew", 148-159; HELD, "Rhetorical Questions", 79; GREENSTEIN, "Interpreting Ancient Texts", 452.

<sup>(36)</sup> On the distinction between rhetorical and conducive questions see R.A. HUDSON, "The Meaning of Questions", *Language* 51 (1975) 17-18; ILIE, *What Else Can I Tell You*, 55-56.

<sup>(37)</sup> Compare, e.g., the answered question in 1 Sam 26,17 and the identical unanswered one in 1 Sam 24,16.

<sup>(38)</sup> In addition, the discourse functions of rhetorical and conducive questions are distinct. In BH prose dialogue conducive questions are typically used to confirm a belief of the speaker (e.g., Gen 43,29); to express surprise (e.g., 1 Sam 10,11); to show the speaker that the hearer knows something to be true (e.g., 1 Kgs 21,19), or to draw attention to a particular fact (e.g., 1 Sam 10,24). None of these functions are characteristic of Biblical RQs.

set of possible answers, while exclamations do not express a question even on the semantic level and are therefore not answerable. Furthermore, RQs and exclamations have strikingly different implications: the rhetorical זֶה יִשְׁעֵנוּ “How will this fellow save us?” (1 Sam 10,27) implies “This fellow cannot save us”, while the exclamation זֶה מִה נִרְאָה הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה “How awesome is this place” (Gen 28,17) implies “This place is very awesome.”

Of the yes-no and content RQs in the corpus, those expressing premises in logical arguments were identified through analysis of the meaning and context of each question. Out of over 300 RQs, 117 were found to be argumentative<sup>(39)</sup>. By expressing the premise as an RQ, the speaker underlines the obviousness and irrefutability of the premise, and hence the conclusion. Argumentative RQs are used for a variety of discourse functions, including justifying a directive (e.g., Gen 47,15), refusing a directive (e.g., Exod 3,11), issuing a criticism (e.g., Exod 14,11), rebutting a criticism (e.g., Exod 16,7), and refuting an assertion (e.g., Num 11,22).

The conclusion in nearly all the arguments involving RQs is a negative proposition involving epistemic modality (possibility or necessity) or deontic modality (permission or obligation). In other words, the conclusion expresses that a particular situation X should not happen/have happened, cannot happen/have happened, is/was not necessary, etc. The conclusion is most commonly expressed by a כִּי clause, as described above<sup>(40)</sup>. The conclusion may also be indirectly represented by a “why” or “what” RQ, e.g., Num 22,37 “Why didn’t you come to me? Am I really unable to honor you” (i.e., “You should have come to me”); Exod 14, 11 “Was it because there were no graves in Egypt that you have brought us to die in the wilderness? What have you done to us, taking us out of Egypt?” (i.e., “You should not have taken us out of Egypt”)<sup>(41)</sup>. In other arguments the conclusion is implicit, e.g., 1 Sam 25,10, “Who is David and who is the son of Jesse? Today there are many servants who are breaking away from their masters” (i.e., “I am not obligated to give your men food”), Gen 30,2 “Can I take the place of God, who has withheld from you the fruit of the womb”, (i.e., “I cannot give you a child”) and Exod 6,30 “I am of impeded speech; how should Pharaoh heed me?” (i.e., “I should not go to Pharaoh”)<sup>(42)</sup>.

<sup>(39)</sup> Double questions that express a single premise are counted as one question; this includes וְאִם/וְאִלֵּין sequences, as in Num 11,22, as well as double appositive questions followed by a כִּי clause that relates to both, e.g., Jud 9,28. Arguments that are requoted are counted as a single argument (e.g., Jud 8,6.15; 1 Kgs 1,3.6.16).

<sup>(40)</sup> A few of the many examples of this structure are Gen 20,9; 37,26; Judg 8,6; 9,28; 14,3; 2 Sam 19,23; 2 Kgs 5,7.

<sup>(41)</sup> The structures in these two verses are simpler versions of the “triple rhetorical question” described above. Although Singer describes such instances are rare, there are a number of occurrences in the classical prose corpus, including, in addition to the two cited above, Gen 18,13-14; Num 22,37; 2 Sam 12,23. In some instances the conclusion is expressed by a “what” question, as in Exod 14,11 (above) and Josh 22,16. In 2 Kgs 19,11-12 the conclusion is expressed by an unmarked yes-no RQ. The “triple rhetorical question” occurs twice in the corpus (Num 11,12; 2 Sam 19,43), as well as a single instance of a “quadruple rhetorical question”, with the premise expressed by a sequence of three yes-no questions (2 Sam 19,36).

<sup>(42)</sup> See also, e.g., Gen 34,31; 43,7; Exod 2,14; 6,12; Num 16,9; 22,38; 2 Kgs 4,28; 18,27.

In the majority of the argumentative RQs in the corpus the premise is a negative assertion and the conclusion is negative as well. In other words, the argument, at least in part, can be expressed as “Not B. Therefore, not A.” This, however, is generally not the complete argument, as the proposition “not B” is typically not sufficient in and of itself to refute A. It is common in arguments occurring in natural dialogue for one or more of the premises to be unexpressed by the speaker and left to be reconstructed by the addressee<sup>(43)</sup>. After reconstructing the missing premise, I found that the majority of the arguments have one of two forms: the logically valid *modus tollens* form (55 RQs), or the invalid denying-the-antecedent form (20)<sup>(44)</sup>. These forms are examined in sections 4 and 5, below.

#### 4. The Modus tollens arguments

*Modus tollens* has the following form:

Premise 1: If A then B.

Premise 2: Not B.

Conclusion: Not A.

*Modus tollens* arguments are logically valid: if whenever A is true B is true, then the falsity of B entails the falsity of A. An example of a RQ expressing *modus tollens* is God’s accusation of Sarah to Abraham in Gen 18,13-14:

“Why did Sarah laugh, saying, ‘Shall I in truth bear a child, old as I am?’ Is anything too great for the LORD?”

In this argument, as in all the *modus tollens* arguments, the first premise is not stated explicitly, and must be reconstructed by the addressee. The conclusion is implied by the initial “why” RQ, i.e., “Sarah should not have laughed.” The argument can be reconstructed as follows<sup>(45)</sup>:

Premise 1: If Sarah’s laughter was justified, then there is something too great for the Lord to perform.

Premise 2: There is nothing that is too great for the Lord.

Conclusion: Sarah should not have laughed.

In Num 11,23 God uses *modus tollens* to undermine Moses’ skepticism regarding His promise to provide enough meat for a month to the entire people. The entire argument is represented by a yes-no RQ: “Is the Lord’s power limited?” Reconstructed, the argument is as follows:

<sup>(43)</sup> On the difficulties that can be involved in reconstructing missing premises in arguments in dialogue, see S. GERRITSEN, “Unexpressed Premises”, *Crucial Concepts in Argumentation Theory* (ed. F.H. VAN EEMEREN) (Amsterdam 2001) 51-79.

<sup>(44)</sup> Most of the remaining RQs involve arguments from consequences or inductive reasoning; these are not addressed further in this article. The conclusions in arguments from consequence generally relate to a future action by the addressee that the speaker does or does not want to occur. Such conclusions are usually expressed as volitive clauses, e.g., Gen 27,43-45; 47,15; Exod 32,12; Num 27,4; 1 Sam 19,17.

<sup>(45)</sup> In this example and subsequent ones, reconstructed premises and conclusions are intended as approximations rather than exact representations.

Premise 1: If God cannot provide food for the entire nation for a month, then His power is limited.

Premise 2: God's power is not limited.

Conclusion: God can provide food for the entire nation for a month.

The premise of *modus tollens* is commonly represented by a yes-no RQ, as in the previous two examples<sup>(46)</sup>. The rhetorical "Is B?" implies the negative proposition "Not B." Content RQs can also express the premise "Not B" in a *modus tollens* argument. Content RQs imply propositions involving the null set, which are generally equivalent to negative propositions. An example is Jacob's retort to Laban in Gen 31,36, "What is my crime, what is my guilt, that you should pursue me?"<sup>(47)</sup> The RQ implies "I have committed no wrong [against you]", which is equivalent to the negative proposition "I have not wronged you." The complete argument is as follows:

Premise 1: If you are justified in pursuing me, I must have wronged you.

Premise 2: I have not wronged you.

Conclusion: You should not pursue me.

The conclusion of a *modus tollens* arguments is true unless one of the premises is false. The premise implied by the RQ, "Not B", is often irrefutable, relating to a proposition B that is absurd or improbable, as in Gen 18,13-14 and Num 11,23, above. Usually the addressee must admit the validity of the first premise, "If A then B", as well, and, consequently, the truth of the conclusion, "Not A." The argument in Gen 18,13-14, above, is presumably compelling from Abraham (and Sarah's) perspectives: they undoubtedly accept God's omnipotence, and cannot challenge the premise that Sarah's laughter is incompatible with belief in God's omnipotence. Sarah's only recourse is to falsely deny that she laughed at all. Her deception is subsequently confronted by God: "No, you did laugh" (v. 15).

In some cases the addressee does not necessarily accept the implication of the RQ as obvious. Such an RQ may be accompanied by supplementary evidence designed to bolster the case for the premise, as when Joseph's brothers defend themselves against Jacob's accusation that they should not have revealed personal details to the Egyptian official (i.e., Joseph):

"The man kept questioning us about ourselves and our family, saying, 'Is your father still alive? Have you another brother?' And we answered him accordingly. Could we in any way know that he would say, 'Bring your brother down?'" (Gen 43,7)

Although the implied premise "We could not have known that he would tell us to bring our brother" is obvious to the brothers, it is not so to Jacob; in fact, it can be assumed from Jacob's accusation that he believes the opposite to be the case. The brothers defend the premise by pointing out that

<sup>(46)</sup> See also, e.g., Gen 18,14,25; 30,2,15; 43,7; Lev 10,19; Num 11,23; 12,2; 16,9,13; 2 Kgs 5,7,26.

<sup>(47)</sup> See also, e.g., Gen 20,9; 31,36; Exod 6,12,30; 16,7,8; Num 16,11; Judg 6,13; 11,26; 2 Kgs 18,34; 19,13.

in the context of their conversation with the official, his questions regarding the family seemed to be an innocent inquiry. Another example is Moses' argument against his appointment as emissary to Pharaoh (Exod 6,12): "The Israelites would not listen to me; how should Pharaoh listen to me, when I have impeded speech?" Since the implied premise "Pharaoh will not listen to me" is debatable, Moses backs up the premise by a קל וחומר (*a fortiori*) argument, "The Israelites would not listen to me", in addition to citing his speech impediment<sup>(48)</sup>.

### 5. Denying the antecedent

Reconstruction as *modus tollens* is problematic for many arguments superficially resembling the ones discussed in the previous section. In Jud 14,3, for example, Samson's parents reply to his demand that they take him a Philistine wife: "Is there no woman among the daughters of your own kinsmen and among all our people, that you go to take a wife from the uncircumcised Philistines?" If we reconstruct the first premise according to the *modus tollens* form, the complete argument is as follows:

Premise 1: If you are justified in going to take a Philistine wife,  
then there are no wives to be found among your own  
people.

Premise 2: There are wives to be found among your own people.

Conclusion: You should not go to take a Philistine wife.

This argument, however, would make no sense to Samson, who clearly does not accept the first premise, i.e., that he is justified in seeking a Philistine wife only in the event that there are no Israelite women to marry. It would be pointless for the speaker to present an argument that he knows the addressee will reject out of hand.

Van Selms' *reductio ad absurdum* interpretation of such arguments (see above) is apparently built on the assumption that the arguments most closely resemble *modus tollens*. Following van Selms' approach, the argument would be reconstructed as follows: "From the fact that you are going to take a Philistine wife, one could almost conclude that there are no eligible Israelite women. Since this is obviously not true, your conduct is not justified." According to van Selms, the speaker is not claiming that the conclusion actually follows from the premise, but that one "could almost" conclude it, or that one "could" conclude it. But how would such an argument be persuasive to an addressee who certainly would not conclude anything of the kind?

I propose that arguments of this type should be understood as denying the antecedent, not *modus tollens*. Denying the antecedent is one of the traditional formal fallacies, taking the following form:

Premise 1: If B then A.

Premise 2: Not B.

Conclusion: Not A.

<sup>(48)</sup> See also the similar Exod 6,30. Additional *modus tollens* arguments that are accompanied by supplementary evidence include Num 22,38 and 1 Sam 25,10.

Denying the antecedent is partially similar to *modus tollens*, having the same second premise and conclusion. Only the first premise differs, with “If B then A” replacing the premise “If A then B.” This simple change converts the argument to a logically invalid form: if whenever B is true A is true, it does not follow that A is false simply because B is false.

Although it is not valid, denying the antecedent can be an effective strategy in rebutting an argument previously made by the addressee: “the antecedent is denied in an attempt to establish that the consequent [i.e., A] is not acceptable on the grounds expressed by the conditional premise”<sup>(49)</sup>. In other words, although denying the antecedent cannot deductively prove that A is false, it can succeed in shifting the burden of proof for A from the speaker to the addressee. By showing that A cannot be justified on the basis of B, the speaker challenges the addressee to put forth a different justification of A. If he cannot, the speaker argues, he should abandon A.

Samson’s parents’ argument is most plausibly reconstructed as denying the antecedent:

Premise 1: If there were no wives to be found among your own people, then you would be justified in going to take a Philistine woman.

Premise 2: There are wives to be found among your own people.

Conclusion: You should not go to take a Philistine wife.

This works as a presumptive argument against Samson’s apparent belief that there is nothing wrong with marrying a Philistine woman. The speakers raise and reject a hypothetical justification for such an action, challenging Samson to come up with a different rationale. The challenge is strengthened by the deliberate selection of a patently false proposition B as the subject of the second premise. By choosing such a proposition, the speaker implicitly conveys his belief that given any hypothetical proposition B such “If B then A”, B is false<sup>(50)</sup>. A similar interpretation can be given to the Philistine’s statement to David in 1 Sam 17,43, another of van Selms’ examples of a *reductio ad absurdum*: “Am I a dog, that you come at me with sticks?” The speaker here implicitly asserts: “If I were a dog, your behavior would be justifiable. Since that is obviously not the case (nor, I believe, is any other proposition B that you might offer in justification for your behavior), your behavior is unjustified.”

Support for this method of interpretation comes from cases when the argument contains a pair of RQs, as in the response of the people of Judah

<sup>(49)</sup> D.M. GODDEN – D. WALTON, “Denying the Antecedent as a Legitimate Argumentative Strategy: A Dialectical Model”, *Informal Logic* 24 (2004) 231. BURKE claims that speakers almost never deny the antecedent, and that arguments that appear to be of this type are really intended as deductively valid *modus ponens* or equivalent *modus tollens* arguments: M.B. BURKE, “Denying the Antecedent: A Common Fallacy”, *Informal Logic* 16 (1994) 23-30. For discussion and rebuttal of Burke’s view, see GODDEN – WALTON, “Denying the Antecedent”.

<sup>(50)</sup> Although the speakers may well believe in addition that there is no conditional “If B then A” other than the one used in the argument, i.e., that the absence of any eligible Israelite women is the *only* justification for marrying a Philistine, this is not essential to the argument. As shown below, in some arguments it is clear that the speakers are willing to concede the truth of conditionals aside from those utilized in the argument.

to the charge that they have unfairly monopolized the king (2 Sam 19,43). A pair of RQs representing the premise “Not (B or C)” are preceded by a “why” RQ implying the conclusion “Not A”:

“Why are you angry over this matter? Have we consumed anything that belongs to the king? Has he given us any gifts?”

If this were *modus tollens*, the argument would be “If you are angry with us, then it must be that we have consumed something that belongs to the king or that we have received gifts from the king. Since neither of these is the case, you should not be angry with us.” But clearly the speakers do not mean to assert that these are the only possible reasons for the Israelites to be angry with them regarding the king. These are merely examples of situations that the speakers admit would constitute legitimate grievances if they had occurred. In other words, in the *modus tollens* reconstruction the first premise in the argument is false, rendering the argument incorrect even from the perspective of the speaker. The denying-the-antecedent form yields a better result:

“If we had consumed something that belongs to the king or we had received gifts from the king, then you would be justified in being angry with us. Neither of these situations is the case (nor, we believe, are any other situations that would justify your anger.) Therefore, you should not be angry with us.”

In nearly all examples of denying the antecedent the premise is expressed by a yes-no question, e.g.,<sup>(51)</sup>

“Now he is dead; why should I fast? Can I bring him back again?” (2 Sam 12,23)

“Are the palms of Zebah and Zalmunna already in your hands, that we should give bread to your troops?” (Judg 8,6)

In a few instances the premise is expressed by a content RQ, e.g.,

How many years are left to me, that I should go up with the king to Jerusalem? (2 Sam 19,35)

What do you lack with me, that you seek to go to your own country? (1 Kgs 11,22)

## 6. Presumptive *modus tollens*

As described above, deductive *modus tollens* and presumptive denying of the antecedent are neatly distinguished both in logical nature and in argumentative purpose. Examination of the Biblical corpus, however, shows that *modus tollens* has a presumptive use that closely mirrors denying the antecedent. In order to illustrate this point, I examine a discourse function typical of argumentative RQs: refusal of a directive previously issued by the addressee.

Directives can be taken to imply a modal proposition A of the form,

<sup>(51)</sup> See also, e.g., Gen 31,14; Exod 14,11; Num 11,12,22; 22,37; Judg 8,15; 14,3; 1 Sam 17,43; 2 Sam 3,8; 12,23; 19,36.



"You should do X." In presenting an argument demonstrating the proposition "Not A", the speaker implicitly expresses his refusal to comply. The goal of arguments that serve as refusals is to induce the addressee to withdraw the directive. *Modus tollens* and denying the antecedent are both used to refuse directives. Denying the antecedent challenges the addressee to justify the directive, and conveys the speaker's belief that the directive is in fact unjustifiable. Such arguments may be effective in cases where the addressee does not wish or is not able to impose his or her will on an uncooperative speaker<sup>(52)</sup>. In other cases, denying the antecedent fails to induce the addressee to withdraw the directive. In 1 Kgs 11,22, above, for example, the addressee rejects the argument with a simple "no", followed by a repetition of the directive.

*Modus tollens* can be a more definitive means of refusal, as in the Rabshakeh's response in 2 Kgs 18,27 to the Judean official's request to speak to them in Aramaic:

Was it to you and your master that my master sent me to speak these words? Why, it was to the men who are sitting on the wall, who will have to eat their dung and to drink their urine with you.

The Rabshakeh's argument can be analyzed as follows: "If we should talk to you in a language that the people do not understand, it follows that our message is meant exclusively for you. But our message is meant for all the common people. Therefore we should not talk to you in Aramaic." Given the second premise, which the Judean officials have no reason to doubt, the conclusion inexorably follows<sup>(53)</sup>.

In a fair number of refusals by *modus tollens*, however, the premise implied by the RQ is a subjective assertion at odds with the addressee's perspective. An example is the insult/self-abasement formula X מִי "Who is X" mentioned earlier, e.g. <sup>(54)</sup>,

Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh and take the Israelites out of Egypt?" (Exod 3,11)

"Who is X" in arguments like this one implies the premise "X is not worthy of doing Y", where Y is the action that the addressee has just commanded or requested the speaker to perform. The addressee obviously rejects this premise, for s/he would not otherwise have made the speaker the subject of the directive. It is not immediately clear how such an argument can be expected to be compelling from the perspective of the addressee.

Once the purpose of the argument is taken into account, the rationale for refusals involving subjective *modus tollens* becomes clearer. Like denying the antecedent, the subjective *modus tollens* argument makes clear the speaker's negative view of the directive, placing the onus on the addressee to show that the directive is reasonable. In other words, subjective *modus tollens* arguments are in effect presumptive, shifting the burden of proof back to the addressee. It is hoped by the speaker that this will be sufficient to

<sup>(52)</sup> See, e.g., 2 Sam 19,34,36.

<sup>(53)</sup> See also Gen 30,2.

<sup>(54)</sup> See also 1 Sam 18,18; 25,10.

convince the addressee to withdraw the directive. Since the argument is not conclusive, the addressee may reject the argument and persist with the directive. In the argument cited above, for example, God does not accept Moses' refusal and continues to persuade him to accept the mission.

\*  
\* \*

Examination of the Gen-2 Kgs corpus shows that many RQs express premises in logical arguments. The argument is nearly always designed to establish a negative modal proposition. *Modus tollens* and denying the antecedent were identified as accounting for the majority of arguments expressed by RQs. The first type is generally intended to deductively establish its conclusion, while the second serves as a presumptive argument designed to shift the burden of proof to the addressee to show that the conclusion is not true. Premises in *modus tollens* arguments are expressed by yes-no RQs or content RQs, while denying the antecedent almost always involve yes-no RQs. The conclusion in both types of arguments may be expressed by a ׁ clause, a "why" RQ, or not at all. Although in theory *modus tollens* is clearly differentiated from the presumptive argument, in practice the distinction is not as clear-cut. The presumptive *modus tollens*, which is based on a subjective premise, has the effect of challenging the addressee to justify his position. Both *modus tollens* and denying the antecedent can be effective means of refusing directives.

Hebrew Language Department  
Hebrew University  
Mount Scopus, Jerusalem  
Israel

Adina MOSHAVI

#### SUMMARY

Rhetorical questions (henceforth RQs) often express a premise in a logical argument. Although the use of RQs in arguments has been widely noted, the modes of reasoning underlying the arguments have not received sufficient attention. The present study investigates argumentative RQs in the prose dialogue in Genesis through Kings in the light of pragmatic argumentation theory. Two logical forms, *modus tollens* and denying the antecedent, are identified as accounting for the majority of arguments expressed by RQs. The first type is generally intended to deductively establish its conclusion, while the second, formally invalid form is used presumptively to challenge the addressee to justify his position. There is also a presumptive variety of the *modus tollens* argument, which is based on a subjective premise. Both *modus tollens* and denying the antecedent have similar linguistic representations and can be effective means of refusing directives.

## The Song of Moses and Divine Begetting in Matt 1,20

Few would dispute the claim that scriptural traditions play a central role in the Gospel of Matthew, perhaps even more so than in the other Synoptic Gospels<sup>(1)</sup>. Indeed, Matthew's<sup>(2)</sup> concern with what commonly known as the OT cannot be limited to quotations, but is "woven into the warp and woof" of his gospel<sup>(3)</sup>. Therefore, to grasp most fully the nuances of Matthean thought it behoves the interpreter to consider the more subtle ways Matthew engages his scriptural sources. In keeping with this approach, this article will deal with one Matthean tendency: his employment of texts that describe Jesus in terms originally reserved for national Israel, particularly in conjunction with Jesus' status as Son of God<sup>(4)</sup>. This is especially prominent in the first few chapters of Matthew, which closely associate Jesus with Israel as part of a concentrated christological focus<sup>(5)</sup>.

### 1. Characteristics and Circulation of the Song of Moses

It will be helpful to begin by considering a few characteristics of the Song of Moses (Deut 32,1-43). In the wider context of Deuteronomy in its present form, the Song serves as a climactic, concluding hymn that sums up in a memorable, emphatic way the message of the entire book<sup>(6)</sup>. The Song

<sup>(1)</sup> The index of OT quotations in *UBSGNT* (pp. 888-889) lists 56 citations to the OT in Matthew, whereas Mark and Luke have 54 between them. The same index lists an additional 262 OT allusions and verbal parallels in Matthew. Cf. R.T. FRANCE, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2007) 10.

<sup>(2)</sup> "Matthew" is used here as a standard way of referring to the anonymous author of the gospel.

<sup>(3)</sup> G.N. STANTON, "Matthew", *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars eds. D.A. CARSON – H.G.M. WILLIAMSON (Cambridge 1988) 205.

<sup>(4)</sup> A few works will be representative of this widespread view: D.C. ALLISON, Jr., "The Son of God as Israel: A Note on Matthean Christology", *IBSt* 9 (1987) 74-81; W.D. DAVIES – D.C. ALLISON, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh 1988-1997) I, 263-264; T. DE KRUIJF, *Der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes*. Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums (AnBib 16; Rome 1962) 57; J. NOLLAND, *The Gospel of Matthew*. A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI 2005) 123; J.A.E. VAN DODEWAARD, "La force évocatrice de la citation mise en lumière en prenant pour base l'Évangile de S. Matthieu", *Bib* 36 (1955) 488; R.E. BROWN, *The Birth of the Messiah*. A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke (ABRL; New York 1993) 215; FRANCE, *Matthew*, 77-78; J.A. GIBBS, "Israel Standing with Israel: The Baptism of Jesus in Matthew's Gospel (Matt 3:13-17)", *CBQ* 64 (2002) 518.

<sup>(5)</sup> W.L. KYNES, *A Christology of Solidarity*. Jesus as the Representative of His People in Matthew (New York 1991) 11; U. LUZ, *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (trans. J.B. ROBINSON) (Cambridge 1995) 30-37. Cf. K. STENDAHL, "Quis et Unde? An Analysis of Matthew 1-2", *Judentums, Urchristentums, Kirche*. Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias (ed. W. ELTESTER) (BZNW 26; Berlin 1960) 94-105.

<sup>(6)</sup> J.W. WATTS, *Psalm and Story*. Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative (JSOTSS 139; Sheffield 1992) 15, 73-80.

is a covenantal witness against Israel, upbraiding God's people for their rebellion in contrast to his goodness toward them. It speaks of the coming judgment against Israel because of their disobedience, but ends on a hopeful note that reconciliation would be the last word.

Significant for the present study is the use of filial imagery throughout the Song<sup>(7)</sup>. Israel is rebuked for being unfaithful sons of God in v. 5<sup>(8)</sup>, and Yhwh is referred to as Israel's Father in v. 6. In v. 19 the Israelites are accused of being Yhwh's faithless sons and daughters, and v. 20 similarly identifies the Israelites as sons in whom is no faithfulness. These verses are preceded by the rare language of God's divine begetting of Israel in v. 18<sup>(9)</sup>, to which we will return below. In some manuscripts the image of Yhwh's fatherhood and Israel's sonship is also found in v. 43<sup>(10)</sup>. These passages lead to the conclusion that Israel's sonship is a key feature of the Song of Moses.

In terms of circulation, the Song of Moses was a popular, widely utilized text in Second Temple Jewish and early Christian writings, making it probable that Matthew knew Deut 32 in some form. Manuscript evidence from Qumran finds the text preserved in copies of Deuteronomy<sup>(11)</sup>, among special-use manuscripts<sup>(12)</sup>, and non-biblical scrolls reference Deut 32 in numerous places<sup>(13)</sup>. It is quoted frequently in apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings<sup>(14)</sup>, and it is mentioned explicitly by both Philo and Josephus<sup>(15)</sup>. In Christian literature the Song is likely cited in Romans (10,19;12,19;15,10), Philippians (2,15), Acts (17,26), Hebrews (1,6.10,30), Revelation (15,3-4), 1 Clement (3,1.29,2; cf. 59,3-4), and the Book of Odes (2).

In addition to these rather explicit references, it is not difficult to adduce a profusion of other allusions and echoes to Deut 32 in these, and other, documents. The point is simply that the Song of Moses was widely known and employed by authors preceding and roughly contemporaneous with Matthew<sup>(16)</sup>.

(7) Filial imagery is not limited to the Song, but is also found in Deut 1,31; 8,5; 14,1.

(8) MT: יִבְ; LXX τέκνα.

(9) MT: יָלַד; LXX: γεννάω.

(10) LXX, 4QDeut<sup>a</sup>. The language of Israel as sons (and daughters) is plural in vv. 5.19.20 (and 43 LXX); the singular possessive pronouns are used of Israel collectively in vv. 6.18.

(11) 4QDeut<sup>a</sup>, 4QpaleoDeut<sup>a</sup>.

(12) 4QPhylN, 4QDeut<sup>a</sup>. It may be significant for the present argument that the Song as a whole (32,1-43) seems to have been in circulation as a unit. This renders it more likely that Matthew would have known the Song as a unit, and been aware of it well beyond the limits of his supposed sources.

(13) CD V, 16-17; 1QS IX, 23; 1QM XII, 11-12; 1QH XIII, 10.27.

(14) Tob 13-14; Sir 24,13-17; 2 Macc 7,6; 4 Macc 18,18-19; 2 Bar 84,2.6.

(15) Philo, *Leg.* 3,105; *Post.* 121.167; *Plant.* 59; *Deter.* 14; *Sobr.* 10; *Mut.* 182; *Somn.* 2,191; Josephus, *Ant.* 4,303. Cf. C. DOGNIÉZ — M. HARL, *La Bible d'Alexandrie* 5. Le Deutéronome (Paris 1992) 320.

(16) Here it is assumed only that Matthew was written in the first century.

## 2. The Background of Divine Begetting

Taking into consideration this widespread influence of the Song of Moses on the one hand, and the prominence of various passages from Deuteronomy throughout Matthew on the other hand<sup>(17)</sup>, it is proposed here that Deut 32,18 serves as a scriptural precedent for the unique imagery of Jesus' begetting by the Holy Spirit in Matt 1,20<sup>(18)</sup>. Indeed, as C. K. Barrett has so cleverly quipped, one might expect to find scriptural references in this account of Jesus' conception since Matthew is "clearly impregnated with OT ideas"<sup>(19)</sup>.

The pericope in view immediately follows the genealogy that traces the lineage of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham. Verses 18-25 recount the revelation to and response of Joseph to the angelic message that Mary was with child. The key Matthean phrase for the present purposes is: τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου ("that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit" [RSV])<sup>(20)</sup>. A glance at Deut 32,18 LXX shows that the verb γεννώ is there used to indicate God's begetting of Israel, his son (θεὸν τὸν γεννήσαντά σε). It is highly significant that the ascription of this particular paternal activity to God, using the term γεννώ, is rare in the LXX. Here it translates the Hebrew יָלַד (Qal), a verb that is attributed to God in the MT even less frequently than γεννώ is in the LXX<sup>(21)</sup>. Relevant passages from the LXX include Isa 1,2; 66,9; Psalms 2,7; Prov 8,25, while Psalm 109,3 LXX attests the slightly different verb

<sup>(17)</sup> Deuteronomy is (at least) the second most cited scriptural corpus in Matthew. Index 4 in NA<sup>27</sup> lists 10 citations to Deuteronomy in Matthew, second only to Isaiah's 12. Interestingly, *UBSGNT*<sup>2</sup> lists 13 citations to Deuteronomy in Matthew, and only 10 to Isaiah. M.J.J. MENKEN ("Deuteronomy in Matthew's Gospel", *Deuteronomy in the New Testament. The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel* [LNTS 358; London 2007] 42) posits 15 citations.

<sup>(18)</sup> Regarding Matthew's supposed *Vorlage(n)*, it will suffice for the present purposes to observe that Matthew's language often reflects the LXX (or his sources), but some of his unique material differs from the LXX, perhaps reflecting his own rendering of the Hebrew. Cf. K. STENDAHL, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (ASNU 20; Lund 1968) 151; R.H. GUNDRY, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NTS 18; Leiden: 1967) 28, 157. Since there is reason to believe that Matthew may have utilized more than one version (in more than one language), it is best to leave open several possibilities when encountering a supposed OT reference, especially an allusive one. It is also significant that the state of the OT text before 100 C.E. was in flux, rendering the identification of the Matthean text-form(s) even more difficult.

<sup>(19)</sup> C.K. BARRETT, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London 1966) 17. BARRETT observes the same is true of Luke. See also the older study of J.G. MACHEN (*The Virgin Birth of Christ* [London 1939] 174), who rightly notes that the character of the Matthean birth narrative is thoroughly Jewish in nature.

<sup>(20)</sup> The construction of the last three words is a bit awkward, as ἐστιν stands between πνεύματος and ἁγίου. BROWN (*Birth of the Messiah*, 130) renders this: "is of a Spirit which is Holy". Similar constructions occur in Luke 2,25; Acts 1,5.

<sup>(21)</sup> R.S. HENDEL ("Begetting' and 'Being Born' in the Pentateuch: Notes on Historical Linguistics and Source Criticism", *VT* 50 [2000] 38-46) notes that the Hiphil pattern of יָלַד came to replace the Qal by exilic and post-exilic times when speaking particularly of the father's (causal) role in begetting. He observes, however, that Deut 32,18 was likely pre-exilic and therefore predated this practice.

ἐκγεννώ. In the MT יָלַד (Qal) is found in Num 11,12 and Ps 2,7. One possible parallel from Qumran is 1QSa II, 11, which may speak of God begetting (יָלַד-[Hiphil]) the Messiah. This reading is supported by Geza Vermes, who suggests that, although the last letter is difficult to determine, computer imaging has made the י more certain<sup>(22)</sup>. Others, however, are more skeptical. These include James H. Charlesworth and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, who suggest that the proper reading of 1QSa II, 11 is יָלִיד- (“he leads forth”)<sup>(23)</sup>. Although a definitive conclusion may not be possible, the rendering of Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck may have more to commend it, especially given the context of 1QSa II<sup>(24)</sup>.

In light of these other passages relating to divine begetting in the OT, the question arises: if one is looking for an OT echo in Matt 1,20, why choose Deut 32,18? Surely the references from Isaiah have much to commend them, especially since Isaiah is most likely the only OT collection cited more frequently than Deuteronomy in Matthew, and Isa 7,14 is quoted only a couple verses later in Matt 1,23.

Alternatively, if Matthew’s use of γεννώ alludes here to Ps 2, it may further highlight Jesus’ status as the ultimate Davidic king — a theme that is clearly important in Matthew, as the opening verse of the gospel indicates. Indeed, Novakovic suggests it is “very likely” that the Evangelist deliberately uses γεννώ in Matt 1 to allude to God’s begetting the Messiah in Ps 2,7<sup>(25)</sup>. Another work that relates Jesus’ begetting to the OT use of γεννώ is B. M. Nolan’s 1979 monograph<sup>(26)</sup>. He suggests the name κύριος for the deity in Matt 1-2 is significant, since this title is used for Jesus elsewhere in the gospel. He also sees here a connection to Ps 2,7, where the Lord (κύριος) declares the Davidic king to be his son. Although Nolan’s argument has much to commend it, not least of which is his focus on the significance of γεννώ in these verses, his is not the best explanation. Nolan claims: “in the Old Testament only the Davidic king is divinely declared son to God, at his succession”<sup>(27)</sup>. However, this is not entirely correct. In the OT the nation of Israel was portrayed as God’s son more often than the king<sup>(28)</sup>. If, however, Nolan intends to emphasize the *declaration* of the king’s sonship the difficulty remains. The declaration of sonship is indeed divinely proclaimed in Ps 2, but one should not discount the divinely

<sup>(22)</sup> G. VERMES, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York 1997) 159; BROWN, *Birth of the Messiah*, 137, n. 14.

<sup>(23)</sup> J.H. CHARLESWORTH – L.T. STUCKENBRUCK, “Rule of the Congregation (1QSa)”, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations (ed. J.H. CHARLESWORTH) (Tübingen 1994) I, 116-117. For more on the debate, see L. NOVAKOVIC, *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick*. A Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew (WUNT II/170; Tübingen 2003) 22, n. 51.

<sup>(24)</sup> So DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, 215.

<sup>(25)</sup> NOVAKOVIC, *Messiah*, 46-50.

<sup>(26)</sup> B.M. NOLAN, *The Royal Son of God*. The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel (OBO 23; Göttingen 1979) 224.

<sup>(27)</sup> NOLAN, *Royal Son*, 224.

<sup>(28)</sup> So G. FOHRER, “υἱος, υιοθεσία,” *TDNT* VIII, 340-354; cf. G. COOKE, “The Israelite King as Son of God”, *ZAW* 73 (1961) 217.

ordained pronouncements of Israel's divine sonship spoken in Deuteronomy by Moses, the prophet *par excellence*<sup>(29)</sup>.

Other options for the language of divine begetting in Matt 1 include Psa 109,3 LXX, which is quoted elsewhere in Matthew (22,44), apparently in connection with Jesus' Davidic sonship. However, Ps 109,3 LXX attests a slightly different word (ἐκγεννώω) than Matt 1,20 (γεννώω)<sup>(30)</sup>. It is similarly unlikely that the passing reference to Israel's divine begetting in Num 11,12 (MT) is of any great consequence in Matt 1, as it only implies what Deut 32,18 makes explicit.

In sum it may be observed that Deut 32,18 is not commonly associated with Jesus' conception in Matthew, and, more broadly, very few have observed the relationship of Deut 32,18 to Matthew in any way<sup>(31)</sup>. However, it will be argued below that the language of divine begetting in combination with the fecundity of filial language throughout Deut 32 do not merely render the associations between Deut 32,18 and Matt 1,20 possible, but probable.

### 3. The Significance of Divine Begetting in Matthew 1

Although the imagery of divine begetting does occur in a few other texts from the OT and it is feasible that one or more of these passages have been brought to bear on Matt 1,18-25 it is more likely that Deut 32,18 serves as a Scriptural precedent for Jesus' divine begetting in Matt 1 for several reasons.

#### a) Deuteronomy 32 in Matthew

First, allusions to Deut 32,5.20 in Matt 12,39 and 17,17 indicate that Matthew most likely knew Deut 32 in some form. It is also possible that Deut 32 is in view in Matt 12,45; 16,4. This makes it plausible that he alludes to Deut 32 elsewhere.

Admittedly, the verbal parallels with Deut 32,5 in Matt 12,39 are not overwhelming, as the agreement is mainly conceptual. Indeed, only *γενεά* is shared vocabulary from the LXX<sup>(32)</sup>. Nevertheless, this Deuteronomic allusion is affirmed by numerous commentators<sup>(33)</sup> and is included in Index 4 of NA<sup>27</sup>, which is considered here to be generally reliable. The influence of Deut 32 is even clearer in Matt 17, as *γενεά / διεστραμμένη* in 17,17 echo Deut 32,5 LXX, while *γενεά / ἄπιστος* reflect Deut 32,20 LXX (οὐκ ἔστιν πίστις).

<sup>(29)</sup> Note especially the sermonic expositions of Israel's filial status: Deut 14,1; 32,4-6.18-20.

<sup>(30)</sup> Although A does read ἐγεννήσα.

<sup>(31)</sup> One exception is P. NEPPER-CHRISTENSEN, *Das Matthäusevangelium. Ein judenchristliches Evangelium?* (ATHD 1; Aarhus 1958) 167. He notes the typological relationship of national Israel begotten by God in Deut 32,18 with Jesus in Matt 2,15.

<sup>(32)</sup> Although it is, of course, possible that Matthew has produced his own translation from a Hebrew *Vorlage*.

<sup>(33)</sup> E.g., DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew*, II, 354; C.S. KEENER, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI 1999) 367; FRANCE, *Matthew*, 433, n. 47; D.L. TURNER, *Matthew* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2008) 326.

### b) Thematic Link: Divine Sonship

Second, the concept of divine sonship serves as a thematic link between Deut 32 and Matt 1<sup>(34)</sup>. As noted above, one of the references to Israel's identity as God's children comes in Deut 32,5. Significantly, Matthew alludes to the second half of this same verse in 12,39. Thus, Matthew alludes to a portion of the Song of Moses (32,5b) that immediately follows explicit mention of Israel's sonship (32,5a). Similarly, Matt 17,17 draws upon Deut 32,5.20, both of which mention Israel's filial identity. It thus appears that Matthew, although he has likely taken these references over from his sources<sup>(35)</sup>, has strategically included portions of Deut 32 in his gospel that deal explicitly with Israel's divine sonship.

However, the widespread knowledge of the Song of Moses and the thematic similarities between Deut 32 and Matt 1 suggest that Matthew's familiarity with Deut 32 was not limited to what he found in his sources. Just as Israel is portrayed as God's son in the Song of Moses, so is the divine sonship of Jesus in view in Matt 1. This, however, is a contested point<sup>(36)</sup>. Some have argued that Matt 1 primarily concerns Jesus' Davidic sonship rather than his divine sonship<sup>(37)</sup>. However, the motif of Jesus' Davidic sonship, while clearly a concern of the opening chapter and entire Gospel of Matthew, does not eclipse Jesus' divine sonship. Matthew's purposes here are complex, so it would be a false dichotomy to suggest that Matthew has either Davidic or divine sonship in view. Instead, both are key themes throughout the gospel (and Matt 1), and it is not possible to divorce one from the other<sup>(38)</sup>. However, if one must press the relationship between the two, Jesus' divine sonship appears to be the basis for his Davidic sonship. In the words of David Bauer: "Matthew indicates that Jesus is able to function as son of David *precisely because* he is also the Son of God who has been conceived by the Holy Spirit (1:18, 20)"<sup>(39)</sup>. It is also instructive that Novakovic, whose work focuses on Jesus as the Son of David, similarly argues that Jesus' divine sonship is in view in Matt 1<sup>(40)</sup>.

### c) Obedience versus Disobedience

This leads to the third observation: a reference to Deut 32 in Matt 1 anticipates two interrelated themes that are developed more fully throughout

<sup>(34)</sup> It should also be noted that Deut 22,20-24 is assumed in Matt 1,18-23.

<sup>(35)</sup> See the parallels in Mark 9,19; 11,29; Luke 9,41.

<sup>(36)</sup> Among those who posit Son of God Christology in Matt 1 are R. PESCH, "Der Gottessohn im matthäischen Evangelienprolog (Mt 1-2): Beobachtungen zu den Zitationsformeln der Reflexionszitate", *Bib* 48 (1967) 397; O. CULLMANN, *The Christology of the New Testament* (trans. S.C. GUTHRIE – C.A.M. HALL) (Philadelphia, PA 1963) 296; D.A. HANGER, *Matthew 1-14* (WBC 33A; Dallas, TX 1993) 17.

<sup>(37)</sup> So, e.g., J. NOLLAND, "No Son-of-God-Christology in Matthew 1:18-25", *JSNNT* 62 (1996) 11.

<sup>(38)</sup> Cf. M.D. JOHNSON, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies*. With Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus (SNTSMS 8; Cambridge 1988) 224-228.

<sup>(39)</sup> D.R. BAUER, "The Kingship of Jesus in the Matthean Infancy Narrative: A Literary Analysis", *CBQ* 57 (1995) 308-309 (*italics added*).

<sup>(40)</sup> NOVAKOVIC, *Messiah*, 46-47, 63.



the gospel. These are: (i) Jesus as the obedient Son of God, in contrast to (ii) disobedient Israel<sup>(41)</sup>.

Matthew clearly portrays Jesus' obedient sonship in light of Israel at other points in his gospel, and this passage may be one more indication of this tendency<sup>(42)</sup>. Of course, this passage would be only a veiled reference to Jesus' filial obedience, but it lies squarely in the trajectory that becomes clearer as the first few chapters of Matthew unfold. Jesus' obedience is also be highlighted by the pronouncement in 1,21 that he will save his people from their sins<sup>(43)</sup>. Whatever one's view regarding who Matthew intends by the phrase τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ in 1,21, a probable allusion to Ps 130,8 (129,8 LXX), which speaks of Israel's redemption, and the lengths to which Matthew has gone in the genealogy to link Jesus with Israel's history, suggest 1,21 refers in some way to Israel<sup>(44)</sup>. If it is correct to see in Jesus' divine begetting an allusion to Israel's begetting in Deut 32,18, this would link Jesus anaphorically to Israel's failures in the exile (1,11-12.17), and cataphorically to Israel's need of redemption (1,21). Indeed, the sin in view in 1,21 includes Israel's exile mentioned in the genealogy<sup>(45)</sup>, which was a primary curse of Deuteronomy in general (Deut 28,36-38), and the Song of Moses in particular (Deut 32,21). Thus, the application of a text that speaks of Israel's divine begetting from the Song of Moses to Jesus would both closely identify him with Israel and distinguish him from them as their Deliverer who will be seen to "fulfill all righteousness" (3,15).

<sup>(41)</sup> Matthew's treatment of Israel is notoriously complex. For the present purposes, the comments of J.R.C. COUSLAND (*The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew* [NTS 102; Leiden 2002] 22) will serve as a general framework. Cousland observes that the Jewish people are represented both as a lost flock who are instinctively drawn to Jesus, their true Shepherd, and as the obdurate people of God who have perennially and consistently rejected God's messengers. Cousland's study, which focuses on the crowds, suggests that the paradox of the crowds is the paradox of the Jewish people. The present article focuses particularly on the obduracy of Israel, which is also a major emphasis of the Song of Moses.

<sup>(42)</sup> Cf. Matt 4,1-11. On Jesus' obedience in Matthew, see DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, 263-264; R. BEATON, *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel* (SNTSMS 123; Cambridge 2003) 176; D.J. VERSEPUT, "The Role and Meaning of the 'Son of God' Title in Matthew's Gospel", *NTS* 33 (1987) 542; R.N. LONGENECKER, "The Foundational Conviction of New Testament Christology: The Obedience/Faithfulness/Sonship of Christ", *Jesus of Nazareth. Essays on the Historical Christ and New Testament Christology* (eds. J.B. GREEN – M. TURNER) (Grand Rapids, MI 1994) 485; T.L. DONALDSON, "The Vindicated Son: A Narrative Approach to Matthean Christology", *Contours of Christology in the New Testament* (ed. R.N. LONGENECKER) (Grand Rapids, MI 2005) 117; D.P. SENIOR, *The Passion Narrative according to Matthew. A Redactional Study* (BETL 39; Leuven 1975) 4; LUZ, *Theology of Matthew*, 36.

<sup>(43)</sup> M.A. POWELL ("The Plots and Subplots of Matthew's Gospel", *NTS* 38 [1992] 195) observes that Matt 9,13 identifies God's people as sinners. Also see 4,17 where the call to repentance assumes the problem of sin.

<sup>(44)</sup> LUZ (*Matthew 1-7. A Commentary* [trans. J.E. CROUCH] [Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2007] 95) believes "his people" refers to Israel. FRANCE (*Matthew*, 53) suggests Israel is the primary referent, but the phrase has universal implications. Similarly, DAVIES – ALLISON (*Matthew*, I, 210) believe the church comprised of both Jews and Gentiles is in view. TURNER (*Matthew*, 67-68) suggests the concept of a remnant of "true Israel".

<sup>(45)</sup> So B. REPSCHINSKI, "'For He Will Save His People from Their Sins' (Matthew 1:21): A Christology for Christian Jews", *CBQ* 68 (2006) 253.

Attention to Matthew's narrative structure further brings out the contrast between Jesus' filial obedience and Israel's filial disobedience. The two other references to Deut 32 noted above (12,39;17,17) are found in contexts that reveal the character of Jesus' sonship. In Matt 12 the condemnation of the scribes and Pharisees, as representative of "this generation" of Israel in v. 39 is followed in v. 50 by a description of true sonship and Jesus' revelation that whoever does the will of his Father is truly his brother, sister, or mother. Here Jesus refers to God as his Father, denoting his divine sonship, before stating the possibility that his disciples could share in that relationship<sup>(46)</sup>. Thus, the sonship of Jesus is unique in that it is direct and unmediated, whereas the disciples' sonship is derivative to that of Jesus<sup>(47)</sup>. But the description in v. 50 that true disciples do the will of Jesus' Father also assumes that Jesus was uniquely the doer of his Father's will<sup>(48)</sup>. In other words, the disciples' ability to share in Jesus' relationship to his Father was contingent upon their participation in the praxis of Jesus. In this way, Jesus and his disciples as children of God in 12,50 are contrasted with disobedient Israel in 12,39.

The contrast between Israel's sonship and Jesus' sonship is also apparent in Matt 17. In 17,17 Jesus employs the language of Deut 32,5.20 to chastise his contemporary generation as "faithless and perverse". The portions of the Song of Moses attributed to Jesus here speak of Israel's rebellion in light of their sonship<sup>(49)</sup>. Since these words are found on the lips of Jesus, who has just been revealed as God's beloved Son in whom God was well-pleased (17,5)<sup>(50)</sup>, it may be that Matthew, by including in v. 17 the portions of the Song of Moses that he did, intended to portray Jesus the faithful son as a foil to Israel the rebellious son.

Israel's disobedience is further emphasized when the pejorative sense attached to "this generation" in Matthew is considered. It is widely accepted that this phrase refers back to particular, well-known generations in Israel's collective memory, such as the wilderness generation<sup>(51)</sup>. Given the prevalence of Pentateuchal imagery in Matthew, it is reasonable to conclude that the wilderness generation is part of the proper background for understanding Matthew's negative references to the generation of Jesus' day, such as in 12,39;17,17<sup>(52)</sup>. Just as Israel's hard-heartedness is in view

<sup>(46)</sup> The phrase τοῦ πατρός μου, which highlights Jesus' filial relationship to God, is a Matthean redaction.

<sup>(47)</sup> So R.J. BAUCKHAM, "The Sonship of the Historical Jesus in Christology", *SJT* 31 (1978) 248-250; H. PATTARUMADATHIL, *Your Father in Heaven*. Discipleship in Matthew as a Process of Becoming Children of God (AnBib 172; Rome 2008) 207-208.

<sup>(48)</sup> This goes one step further than S.C. BARTON (*Discipleship and Family Ties in Mark and Matthew* [SNTSMS 80; Cambridge 1994] 189) who focuses on Jesus as the ultimate *revealer* of the Father's will.

<sup>(49)</sup> MT: ἡ (vv. 5.20); LXX: τέκνα (v. 5); υἱοί, (v. 20).

<sup>(50)</sup> This last phrase is another Matthean redaction, presumably referencing Jesus' faithful obedience. It is also found in some manuscripts of Mark 9,7 (ⲙ ⲁ), but these have surely been influenced by Matthew, rather than the other way around.

<sup>(51)</sup> E. LÖVESTAM, "The ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς Eschatology in Mk 13,30 par.", *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (ed. J. LAMBRECHT) (BETL 53; Leuven 1980) 403-413.

<sup>(52)</sup> Perhaps it is significant that the wilderness generation, like the generation of

in the Song of Moses, so is Israel in general portrayed as sinful and rebellious throughout Matthew. Indeed, in Matthew Jesus comes mainly to preach the need for repentance to Israel and only rarely veers off this path to the surrounding peoples<sup>(53)</sup>.

Thus it seems that Matthew was aware of Israel's filial portrayal throughout the Song of Moses and understands Israel's sonship there to be a foil to Jesus' sonship. The reference to Deut 32,18 in Matt 1,20 recalls Israel's disobedient sonship and anticipates Jesus' obedient sonship — two themes that will be revisited throughout the gospel.

#### d) *New Creation*

Fourth, a reference to Deut 32 is appropriate in light of the creation motifs of Matt 1. The understanding of βίβλος γενέσεως in 1,1 has been widely debated<sup>(54)</sup>. One aspect of that debate is whether some notion of (new) creation is in view. If Deut 32 — a passage that echoes language from Gen 1 — has been employed in the account of Jesus' conception, this would support the interpretation that Matt 1 evokes elements of creation from the Book of Genesis<sup>(55)</sup>. Indeed, this connection with creation would also help explain how Deut 32,18 could be in view in Matt 1,20 since Matthew, unlike Deut 32, does not attribute the begetting to God, but to the Holy Spirit<sup>(56)</sup>. However, this is ultimately not a problem when one considers in greater detail the role Matthew attributes to the Spirit.

Stated briefly, among the Synoptics Matthew most closely associates the Spirit with God the Father<sup>(57)</sup>. A survey of texts will illustrate this. In 4,1 it is the *Spirit* that leads Jesus into the wilderness. The verb ἀνάγω here suggests a more personal agent than Mark's ἐκβάλλω, as it recalls Yhwh's personal direction in the wilderness wanderings<sup>(58)</sup>. In 3,16 the divine

---

Jesus' day, also disbelieved in spite of signs and wonders. FRANCE (*Matthew*, 433, n. 47) observes that Deut 32.5 influences all the Matthean occurrences of "this generation" (11,16;12,41-42;23,36;24,34[?]). There is some debate concerning whether only the crowd or the crowd *and* the disciples are in view in 17,17. A number of commentators see the disciples' lack of belief as representative of the disbelief of the entire generation (so DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew*, II, 724; NOLLAND, *Matthew*, 712), but it is probably best to maintain a distinction between the multitude and the disciples (so U. LUZ, *Matthew* 8–20. A Commentary [trans. J.E. CROUCH] [Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2001] 408).

<sup>(53)</sup> See 4,17; 10,5.

<sup>(54)</sup> This is true concerning both the referent of the term and the extent to which it applies. See the discussion in DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, 149–154.

<sup>(55)</sup> For creation imagery in Matt 1, see DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, 154; FRANCE, *Matthew*, 28; A. PAUL, *L'Évangile de l'Enfance selon Saint Matthieu* (LiBi 17; Paris 1968) 48. Paul highlights the anthropological dimension of new creation: "La première création a pour terme le premier homme, la nouvelle création s'achève à l'Homme Nouveau". For a different view, see J. NOLLAND, "What Kind of Genesis Do We Have in Matt 1.1?", *NTS* 42 (1996) 463–471.

<sup>(56)</sup> Following BROWN (*Birth of the Messiah*, 125) "(Holy) Spirit" is capitalized here in accord with recent Bible custom, without implying the passages in question necessitate a Trinitarian interpretation.

<sup>(57)</sup> J. SCHABERG, *The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit*. The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28.19b (SBLDS 61; Chico, CA 1982) 24. She further notes the Spirit is also closely linked with Jesus, especially in the infancy narrative.

<sup>(58)</sup> KEENER, *Matthew*, 137. Cf. Exod 15,22; Deut 8,2. Similarly, Luke 4,1 reads ἀγω.

connections are even clearer, as the *Spirit of God* rests upon Jesus, empowering him for his ministry<sup>(59)</sup>. More explicit still is the *Spirit of your Father* in 10,20<sup>(60)</sup>. In 12,18 it is the Lord who places *his Spirit* on his Servant, and 12,28 refers to the wonders wrought by the *Spirit of God*. Amazingly, sinning against the *Spirit* in 12,31 is tantamount to sinning against God himself, and the famous triadic phrase in 28,19 somehow unites the Father, Son, and Spirit. Taking into consideration these passages, Schaberg has concluded that there is an undeniable unity between the Father, Son, and Spirit in Matthew<sup>(61)</sup>. Thus, although it would be fallacious to read full-blown Trinitarian doctrine into these references, it should be noted that Matthew attributes to the Spirit some elements of personality and a close relationship to God the Father.

In light of these associations, one may say that for Matthew the Spirit serves as God's powerful and empowering agent to accomplish God's purposes in the world<sup>(62)</sup>. This can be applied to Matt 1, a chapter in which the role of the Holy Spirit in the conception of Jesus is mentioned in both vv. 18,20. And, although v. 20 does not explicitly say that *God* had begotten the child in Mary, in light of the Spirit's close connection with God the Father throughout Matthew, the divine implications are unavoidable: for Mary to be with child by the Holy Spirit is for her to be with child by God himself. It is therefore not necessary to posit a male role for the Spirit. Instead, it is best to identify the activity of the Spirit with God closely enough that Jesus' conception by the Spirit is virtually equivalent to stating God is the one who wrought this event in Mary<sup>(63)</sup>. Once this has been established, one may justifiably speak of Jesus' divine sonship in this passage.

Moreover, it is significant that the Spirit was commonly understood to be the agent of creation; the role of the Spirit in Jesus' conception likewise suggests *new* creation<sup>(64)</sup>. Indeed, the creative role of the Spirit may further explain the use of the Song of Moses in Matt 1. In Deut 32,11 Yhwh is said to hover over Israel like an eagle, employing the Piel of רָחַף. The only other use of רָחַף (Piel) is found in Gen 1,2, where the Spirit of God is said to hover over the waters<sup>(65)</sup>.

Additionally, language from the creation narrative in Gen 1,2 is

<sup>(59)</sup> Significantly, FRANCE (*Matthew*, 121-122) sees here a reference to the hovering of God's Spirit over the waters at creation, and possibly a reference to Deut 32,11.

<sup>(60)</sup> SCHABERG, *Father*, 65, n. 63.

<sup>(61)</sup> SCHABERG, *Father*, 24, 26.

<sup>(62)</sup> NOVAKOVIC (*Messiah*, 46-47) reaches a similar conclusion on the role of the Spirit, and avers that the Spirit's conception as God's creative power implies Jesus' divine sonship.

<sup>(63)</sup> In addition, the aorist passive forms of γεννώω in vv. 16,20 are theological passives that indicate the activity of God (so PESCH, "Gottessohn", 416).

<sup>(64)</sup> So DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, 201; HAGNER, *Matthew 1-13*, 17-18. BROWN (*Birth of the Messiah*, 140, n. 21) and NOLLAND (*Matthew*, 94) do not believe supposed echoes of Gen 1,2 are operative in Matt 1,18,20.

<sup>(65)</sup> This word occurs only one other time in the MT, in Jer 23 (Qal). Gen 1,2 and new creation may also be in view in Matt 3,15-17 where the Spirit descends as a dove. Cf. DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew*, I, 153; T.R. SCHREINER, *New Testament Theology*. Magnifying God in Christ (Grand Rapids, MI 2008) 437.

apparent in Deut 32,10, where Egypt, like the world in the beginning, is described as a *תִּרְוָה*. The reference here to the Exodus is significant because this paradigmatic event is portrayed as the creation of the nation of Israel as God's special people, and therefore as God's son (Exod 4,22). The overlap between Israel's redemption and creation is especially conveyed by the term *קָנָה* in Exod 15,16 and Deut 32,6, the latter of which is related explicitly to God as Israel's Father<sup>(66)</sup>. Thus, in Deut 32 Israel's deliverance is related to Israel's sonship by means of creational language. The allusion to Deut 32,18 in Matt 1,20 evokes this creative and redemptive imagery, further connecting the beginning of the gospel with both the Song of Moses and Gen 1<sup>(67)</sup>. It has been argued that there are insufficient grounds for connecting the Spirit's activity in Jesus' birth with new creation because the latter does not offer an adequate explanation of Jesus' divine sonship<sup>(68)</sup>. However, a reference to the Song of Moses in Matt 1 is able to link the supernatural begetting of Jesus with (new) creation via Israel, thereby answering this objection.

Most of these connections between Gen 1 and Deut 32, however, are only evident in the MT<sup>(69)</sup>. Therefore, this point likely necessitates that Matthew either knew the Hebrew tradition represented in the MT or was familiar with a Greek version that reflected this tradition. Either way, there is widespread agreement that some degree of Hebrew influence is evident in Matthew's scriptural references<sup>(70)</sup>, so it is no stretch to believe that Matthew may have been aware of these associations.

\*  
\* \*

Israel's scriptural traditions pervade the Gospel of Matthew. In the account of Jesus' conception in Matt 1,20, the Evangelist draws upon filial imagery from the Song of Moses in order to connect Jesus with his people and connote Israel's failures to be the faithful son of God. Just as Israel's redemption from Egypt was concomitantly their creation as God's son, so for Matthew the birth of Jesus inaugurated a new creation that would lead to

<sup>(66)</sup> S.R. DRIVER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh 1896) 354; P.C. CRAIGIE, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1976) 379; B.S. CHILDS, *The Book of Exodus. A Critical, Theological Commentary* (OTL; Louisville 1974) 251. Deut 32,6 LXX employs the verb *κτίζω*.

<sup>(67)</sup> There may also be hints of messianic expectations wrapped up in conception by the Spirit, which was thought to have a recreating and revivifying power of the days of the Messiah (so BARRETT, *Holy Spirit*, 21, 23-24).

<sup>(68)</sup> NOVAKOVIC, *Messiah*, 46-50.

<sup>(69)</sup> Note especially Deut 32,10-11 in relation to Gen 1,2. The critical *Vetus Testamentum Graecum* editions of Genesis and Deuteronomy edited by J.W. WEVERS do not list any variants that would verbally link these passages as strongly as they are in the MT.

<sup>(70)</sup> DAVIES – ALLISON (*Matthew*, I, 33, 45) argue that Matthew knew Hebrew. M.J.J. MENKEN, *Matthew's Bible. The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* [BETL 173; Leuven 2004] 7-10, 282) proposes that Matthew used a revised LXX that was often brought into greater conformity with the Hebrew, although he does not believe Matthew's copy of Deuteronomy was revised in this way.

the renewal of God's people when the divinely begotten, obedient Son of God would deliver them from their sins.

University of Edinburgh  
37/5 Orchard Brae Ave  
Edinburgh EH4 2UP — UK

Brandon D. CROWE

#### SUMMARY

It is argued in this article that the imagery of Israel's divine begetting from the Song of Moses (Deut 32,18) is in view in the account of Jesus' divine begetting in Matt 1,20. To establish the plausibility of this claim, the characteristics and widespread knowledge of the Song of Moses are surveyed first, followed by the rationale for positing its presence in Matthew. The allusion to Deut 32,18 in Matt 1,20 is one component of a larger Matthean pattern by which the Evangelist portrays Jesus as the obedient Son of God in contrast to Israel as God's disobedient son. This reference also highlights the imagery of new creation that Matthew associates with the birth of Jesus.

## **The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and Literary Criticism: The Case of Numbers 27,15-23**

The text of the Greek canon of Scripture is not uniform, each book requiring individual consideration as a separate unit of translation. Nonetheless, the majority of the Septuagintal books share a broad base of equivalents, whose origin lies in the Greek translation of the Pentateuch. The acceptance of this translation led to the adoption of this base of equivalents by the translators of the rest of the biblical books<sup>(1)</sup>.

An examination of the degree to which the Septuagintal translators exhibit consistency in their choice of vocabulary can assist us in establishing the level of confidence with which we can reconstruct the Hebrew *Vorlage* which lay before the translators. In those places where the translators chose their Greek equivalents freely, any reconstruction of the original Hebrew text must be tentative. In contrast, in those places where the translators were consistent in their choice of equivalents, such consistency enables us to reconstruct the original Hebrew text with a high degree of confidence<sup>(2)</sup>. Several scholars have demonstrated that in some cases, the translators employ variant sets of Greek equivalents to translate the same Hebrew word(s)<sup>(3)</sup>. This tendency has been taken as evidence of the work of various translators, some scholars appealing to such differences to support literary-critical arguments regarding the biblical texts.

One such instance is the description of the construction of the Tabernacle in Exodus 35–40. Numerous scholars have pointed to the divergences which exist between the manner in which the command to build the Tabernacle (Exodus 25–31) is translated and the description of the implementation of the command (Exodus 35–40). These disparities have led them to conclude that the two units were translated by different hands<sup>(4)</sup>.

(1) E.g. E. Tov, "Studies in the Vocabulary of the LXX: The Relation between Vocabulary and Translation Technique", *Tarbiz* 47 (1977-1978) 121 (Hebrew).

(2) On the use of equivalents to reconstruct the Hebrew *Vorlage* which lay before the translators, see E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem 1997) 60-71. For a survey of the question of the heterogeneity of the Septuagint, see I.L. SEELIGMANN, "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research", *Textus* 15 (1990) 181-201 [Dutch original, 1940]. On the variety between translation styles with respect to technical terms, see, e.g., D.W. GOODING, *The Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus* (Cambridge 1959), 8-13. Rabin has argued that the translators only exercised strict consistency with regard to terms of theological significance: C. RABIN, "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint," *Textus* 6 (1968) 24.

(3) For a survey of the scholarship until 1940, see SEELIGMANN, "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research", 192-194. For a survey of the literature on the use of equivalents to determine the number of translators of the books of the Pentateuch into Greek, see H. KIM, "Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch" (PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem 2006) 3-9.

(4) A survey of the scholarship on this issue can be found in KIM, "Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch", 35-38.

Several scholars have further suggested that the translator of chapters 25–31 did not have chapters 35–40 before him. According to this thesis, the latter chapters were added to the text of Exodus at a later stage and the Hebrew *Vorlage* which lay before the first translator constituted an earlier stage of redaction, one made prior to the addition of these chapters. The change of translator is understood to reflect the various stages of the development of the biblical text: once these chapters had been incorporated into the Hebrew text, they were translated and added to the Septuagint<sup>(5)</sup>.

In this article, I shall employ a similar argument to the one just outlined in order to reconstruct the passage concerning Joshua's investiture in Numbers 27,12-23. After having informed the reader that God commanded Moses to ascend Mount Abarim to die (vv. 12–14), the passage describes Moses' request that God appoint his successor (vv. 15-17). God responds to Moses' appeal, commanding him to appoint a successor by means of a series of specific acts (vv. 18-20a). Joshua's role is defined in vv. 20b-21, and the text subsequently relates that Moses appointed Joshua, performing the required actions in accordance with God's command (vv. 22-23).

The actions which God commanded Moses to carry out in order to complete Joshua's investiture were as follows: 1) to take Joshua (v. 18a); 2) to lean his hands upon him (v. 18b); 3) to stand Joshua in front of Eleazar and the community (v. 19a); 4) to publicly appoint him (v. 19b); 5) to place part of his *הור* upon him (v. 20a)<sup>(6)</sup>.

The fourth action — Joshua's appointment — is formulated by use of the verb *צוה*, whose meaning here, as in several other instances in the Hebrew Bible, is "to appoint"<sup>(7)</sup>. The text's intention appears to be that Moses is to publicly appoint Joshua as his successor<sup>(8)</sup>.

I have argued elsewhere, on the basis of various factors and considerations, that v. 19, which includes Moses' standing Joshua before Eleazar and the community and his public commission, is not part of the

<sup>(5)</sup> See, e.g., A. KUENEN, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch* (London 1886) 79-80 (Dutch original, 1885).

<sup>(6)</sup> On the meaning of *הור* and its significance in this text, see I. KISLEV, "The Investiture of Joshua (Numbers 27:12-23) and the Dispute on the Form of the Leadership in *Yehud*" (forthcoming in VT).

<sup>(7)</sup> Both here and in v. 23, the verb *צוה* carries the meaning of "to appoint to a task": cf. also Num 32,38; Deut 3,31; 31,14. 23; 1 Sam 13,14; 25,30; 2 Sam 6,21; 7,11; Neh 5,14; 1 Chr 22,12. See Nachmanides and Sforza to Num 27,19; A. DILLMANN, *Numeri, Deuteronomium, und Josua* (Leipzig 1886) 180; BDB, s.v. *צוה*, 845; N. LOHFINK, *Theology of the Pentateuch* (trans. L.M. Maloney; Edinburgh 1994) 240 and n. 27; J. MILGROM, *Numbers* (JPS; Philadelphia, PA 1990) 326, n. 42; M. WEINFELD, *From Joshua to Josiah* (Jerusalem 1992) 198 and n. 18 (Hebrew); HALOT, s.v. *צוה* (3:1011). According to the Samaritan addition to the end of Numbers 27, based on Deut 3,21-22, the verb *צוה* is understood in its usual meaning as referring to specific verbal content, however.

<sup>(8)</sup> Lohfink, *Theology of the Pentateuch*, 241-243; D.J. MCCARTHY, "An Installation Genre?", *JBL* 90 (1971) 31-41; J.R. PORTER, "The Succession of Joshua", *Proclamation and Presence. Old Testament Essays in Honour of G.H. Davies* (eds. J.I. DURHAM – J.R. PORTER; Macon, TX 1983) 104-106. It would appear that the significant differences which exist between the examples adduced by these scholars mean that the examples cannot constitute a sufficient basis for reconstructing the way in which such investitures were performed. They can, nevertheless, provide information concerning those descriptions of investitures which employ the verb *צוה*. Porter also believes that the use of this verb is typical of descriptions of this sort: PORTER, "The Succession of Joshua", 107-109.



original text<sup>(9)</sup>. The verse interrupts the original flow of the text, which links God's command to Moses to lean his hands on Joshua in v. 18 with the command to place his *דָּוָר* on him in v. 20. The reference to the placing of *דָּוָר* here is clearly associated with Moses' leaning his hands upon Joshua — rather than constituting a separate and independent action. If this assessment is correct, the words "place some of your *דָּוָר* upon him" represent a purpose clause: "thereby placing some of your *דָּוָר* upon him." According to such a reading, this clause ought to follow immediately after the words "lean your hands upon him." The commands to stand Joshua before Eleazar and the community and to appoint him in v. 19 are consequently not to be understood as belonging to the original text. I have assumed that v. 19 was added in order to harmonize the priestly account of Joshua's investiture in Numbers 27 with the account in Deuteronomy (Deut 3,28; 31,7.14.23, and to emphasize Eleazar's role in the national leadership<sup>(10)</sup>).

On this basis, I concluded that the reference to these actions in the description of the implementation of the command (vv. 22-23) similarly constitutes a secondary addition. I further argued that not only these two actions but the entire detailed description of the implementation and the restatement of the general implementation formula (vv. 22b-23) constitute a latter addition<sup>(11)</sup>.

In support of this claim we can adduce the fact that vv. 22-23 contain two formulations of the implementation of the instructions: "Moses did as the LORD had commanded him" (22a) and "As the LORD had spoken through Moses" (23b). Between these two verses a detailed description of the specific actions performed is inserted. While such a formulation is occasionally preceded or followed by a detailing of actions, the occurrence of a double formulation enveloping a detailed list is exceptional; such examples are almost unattested in the priestly literature<sup>(12)</sup>. The second expression describing the implementation therefore appears to constitute a form of resumptive repetition—indicative of the fact that the entire list of actions represents a latter addition<sup>(13)</sup>.

<sup>(9)</sup> KISLEV, "The Investiture of Joshua". A specification of the considerations appears there, with a full discussion.

<sup>(10)</sup> KISLEV, "The Investiture of Joshua".

<sup>(11)</sup> See KISLEV, "The Investiture of Joshua", and S. MITTMAN, *Deuteronomium 1:1-6:3* (BZAW 139; Berlin 1975) 110.

<sup>(12)</sup> MCEVENUE, following ELLIGER, argues that the fulfillment of the divine word in general, and that of the commandments in particular, is typical of the priestly literature. In a survey of the various occurrences of descriptions of such fulfillments of the divine will, he notes that Gen 1.7.24b-25; Num 20,27-28; 27,22-23 are exceptional in containing both a general implementation formula and a detailed description of the fulfillment of the command: K. ELLIGER, "Sinn und Ursprung der Priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung", *Kleine Schriften zum Alten Testament* (Munich 1966) 174-199 (= ZTK 49 [1952] 121-143); S. MCEVENUE, "Word and Fulfilment: A Stylistic Feature of the Priestly Writer," *Semitics* 1 (1970) 104-106; cf. also J. BLENKINSOPP, "The Structure of P", *CBQ* 38 (1976) 275-277. Num 27,22-23 is unique in this regard in containing a double formulation of the implementation process in addition to an enumeration of the details. A similar phenomenon can be found in the description of the preparation of the priestly garments in Exodus 39,1-31 and the description of the erection of the Tabernacle in Exodus 40,16-33 (and cf. Num 8,20-22).

<sup>(13)</sup> KISLEV, "The Investiture of Joshua".

An examination of the LXX translation of these verses may strengthen the claim that the depiction of the implementation in vv. 22b–23 constitutes a later addition and provide more evidence concerning the development of this text. In the Masoretic Text, the two formulations describing the implementation process differ. The first reads: וַיַּעַשׂ מֹשֶׁה כְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֵתוֹ “Moses did as the LORD had commanded him,” while the second reads: וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה “As the LORD had spoken through Moses.” In the LXX, the first formulation is translated: καὶ ἐποίησεν Μωϋσῆς καθὰ ἐνετείλατο αὐτῷ κύριος; while the second is rendered: καθάπερ συνέταξεν κύριος τῷ Μωϋσῇ. While the Hebrew *Vorlage* behind the first phrase in the LXX almost certainly resembled the MT, it is reasonable to assume that, in contrast to the MT, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the second phrase read כְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֵת מֹשֶׁה, “as the LORD had commanded Moses”<sup>(14)</sup>. The verb συντάσσω renders the verb דָּבַר only five times and the noun דָּבָר only once. It is the standard equivalent of צִוָּה<sup>(15)</sup>.

Several further textual witnesses may be adduced for the use of the verb צִוָּה in the second phrase of the verse<sup>(16)</sup>. To these, midrashic evidence may also be added. *Sifrei* to Numbers 27,23 states: “‘and he commanded him as the LORD had commanded Moses’—Moses commanded Joshua with joy as the LORD had commanded him with joy” (§141; Horowitz ed., p. 187). While not all manuscripts contain this reading of the verse<sup>(17)</sup>, it is clear from the content that the verb צִוָּה existed in the text which lay before the midrashic author. The midrashist compares the commands which Moses gave to Joshua with God’s command to Moses. Without the presence of the root צִוָּה in v. 23, no basis for this interpretation would exist. We can therefore conclude that the textual reading of v. 23 which lay before the midrashist was כְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה “as the LORD had commanded.” Those manuscripts of the midrash which possess the text as it appears in MT are to be regarded as having been altered by scribes seeking to harmonize the biblical text recorded in the midrash with the MT. The midrash and the other textual witnesses thus strengthen the claim that the reading כְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה “as the LORD had commanded” also lay before the Greek translators.

It would also appear that the phrase “through Moses” (literally, “by the hand of Moses” בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה) was lacking from the Hebrew source on which the Septuagint text is based. It was replaced by the phrase τῷ Μωϋσῇ “to Moses,” which probably reflects the Hebrew expression אֵת מֹשֶׁה<sup>(18)</sup>. The phrase בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה “through Moses” appears 31 times in the MT and is generally translated in the Septuagint by the phrase ἐν χειρὶ Μωϋσῃ<sup>(19)</sup>.

<sup>(14)</sup> J.W. WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* (Atlanta, GA 1998) 469.

<sup>(15)</sup> With the exception of the present case, the verb συντάσσω translates the verb דָּבַר in Exod 1,17; 9,12; 31,13; Joel 4,8; Job 42,9, and in one other case the noun דָּבָר (Exod 12,35). According to E.C. DOS SANTOS, *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint* (Jerusalem 1973), συντάσσω renders the verb צִוָּה 79 times.

<sup>(16)</sup> Several Hebrew mss, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Vulgate; see BHS.

<sup>(17)</sup> See the critical apparatus in the HOROWITZ edition, p. 187.

<sup>(18)</sup> WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*, 469.

<sup>(19)</sup> The phrase בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה appears in Exod 9,35; 34,29; 35,29; Lev 8,36; 10,11; 26,46; Num 4,37.45.49; 9,23; 10,13; 15,23; 17,5; 27,23; 33,1; 36,13; Josh 14,2; 20,2; 21,2.8;

Here, too, textual witnesses to the reading **אֶת מֹשֶׁה** exist, a fact which makes it reasonable to assume that the Septuagint also reflects such a text<sup>(20)</sup>.

According to this reconstructed *Vorlage*, the phrase **כִּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה** appeared twice in these verses. The Greek text has no such duplication, however. The first time this phrase appears, the Septuagintal text employs the verb ἐντέλλομαι, while the second time it uses συντάσσω. Both these verbs are standard equivalents for צִוָּה and represent appropriate translations of the Hebrew root<sup>(21)</sup>. Why, however, did the translator alternate the Greek verb he used to translate the Hebrew verb צִוָּה? Such alternation between the use of ἐντέλλομαι and συντάσσω to render צִוָּה is indeed not uncommon in the Septuagintal text of the book of Numbers. The verb ἐντέλλομαι translates צִוָּה 18 times, whereas συντάσσω does so 28 times<sup>(22)</sup>. These two verbs also occur in close proximity to one another in Num 2,33-34; 8,20.22; 34,13, and 36,2.5-6.

This discrepancy must be considered in the light of two other differences regarding the description of the implementation process in vv. 22-23, however. While the word כִּאֲשֶׁר in v. 22 is rendered by the term καθά, in v. 23, καθάπερ appears. John Wevers has noted that while this is an exact translation, this is the sole place in Numbers where the word כִּאֲשֶׁר is rendered as καθάπερ in the phrase **כִּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת מֹשֶׁה** or in similar formulations of the implementation of a divine command<sup>(23)</sup>.

Furthermore, the verb צִוָּה occurs once more in our passage, in the description of Moses' implementation of one of the commands connected

22,9; Judg 3,4; 1 Kgs 8,53.56; Ps. 77,21; Neh 8,14; 9,14; 10,30; 2 Chr 33,8; 34,14; 35,6. With the exception of 12 instances (Exod 9,35; 34,29; 35,29; Lev 8,36; 10,11; Num 27,23; Josh 14,2; 20,2; 21,8; Neh 8,14; 2 Chr 34,14; 35,6), the expression is rendered by the phrase ἐν χειρὶ Μωϋσῆ. Of these exceptions, in three cases (Lev 10,11; 2 Chr 34,14; 35,6) it is translated using διὰ χειρὸς Μωϋσῆ. In Josh 14,2, the expression ἐν χειρὶ Ἰησοῦ occurs. In Exod 34,29, the phrase is translated as ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν Μωϋσῆ, and in Exod 35,29 and Josh 20,2 as διὰ Μωϋσῆ. In the five remaining cases (Exod 9,35; Lev 8,36; Num 27,23; Josh 21,8; Neh 8,14), we find the phrase τῷ Μωϋσῆ. It is clear that, with the sole exception of Num 27,23, wherever the phrase **בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה** appears in the book of Numbers it is translated using the Greek ἐν χειρὶ Μωϋσῆ. For the translation of מֹשֶׁה בְּיַד using the regular dative, see J. JOOSTEN, "L'Excédent Massorétique du Livre de Jérémie et l'Hébreu Post-Classique", *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period* (eds. J. JOOSTEN – J.S. REY) (STDJ 73; Leiden 2008) 104, n. 45.

<sup>(20)</sup> Several Hebrew mss, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (see BHS) and the midrash cited above reflect the reading **אֶת מֹשֶׁה**. Also in Neh 8,14 several Hebrew mss and versions reflect the reading **אֶת מֹשֶׁה**; see BHS there.

<sup>(21)</sup> According to DOS SANTOS, *Expanded Hebrew Index*, ἐντέλλομαι is employed to translate צִוָּה 339 times.

<sup>(22)</sup> These data follow KIM, "Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch", 126. Kim notes that, in contrast to the translator of Leviticus, the translator of Numbers prefers συντάσσω when the person giving the command is God, whereas he prefers to translate the verb צִוָּה by ἐντέλλομαι when a human being is the initiator (ibid, 147). On the use of Greek verbs signifying "command" in the LXX, see J.A.L. LEE, "A Lexical Study Thirty Years On, With Observations on 'Order' Words in the LXX Pentateuch", *Emanuel. Studies in the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (eds. S.M. PAUL – R.A. KRAFT – L.H. SCHIFFMAN) (VTSup 94; Boston 2003) 513-524.

<sup>(23)</sup> WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*, 469; J.W. WEVERS, *Text History of the Greek Numbers* (AAWG. MSU 16; Göttingen 1982) 127.

with Joshua's investiture (v. 23). In this case, the Septuagint text translates the Hebrew root by the Greek verb συνίστημι, whose meaning in this context is "to appoint"<sup>(24)</sup>. The translator here correctly understood that the verb צִוָּה is not used in its regular signification of "command" but in its much rarer meaning of "to appoint"<sup>(25)</sup>. While in the command section, wherein God explains to Moses the process of Joshua's investiture (vv. 18-20), the verb צִוָּה similarly signifies "to appoint," the Greek text renders this root by the verb ἐντέλλομαι, whose meaning is "to command". It is highly unlikely that the translator suddenly understood this unusual usage of the verb צִוָּה precisely between his translation of v. 19 and v. 23. Even were this true, he could easily have gone back and emended his translation of v. 19<sup>(26)</sup>.

The alternation between these terms is distinctive and of considerable significance for our argument. The appearance of the word καθάπερ in this context and the fact that, in contrast to v. 19, the root צִוָּה is rendered by the Greek συνίστημι — which accurately reflects the meaning of the Hebrew verb in this context<sup>(27)</sup> — point to the irregular nature of vv. 22b-23 in the Septuagintal text. The anomaly can be ascribed to various causes. It may represent variations within Septuagintal vocabulary<sup>(28)</sup>, the reworking of the section by a later hand, or a switch in translators at this point and onwards.

Nonetheless, it is implausible that a reworking which correctly translated צִוָּה as συνέστησεν in v. 23 would have failed to employ the same verb in v. 19. The suggestion that these differences reflect variations within Septuagintal vocabulary is also unconvincing, especially where a significant discrepancy in meaning between the two verbs in question exists. Moreover, in order to demonstrate the replacement of one translator by another from this point on, further evidence that a new translator began his work exactly at this point is necessary. The appearance of καθάπερ in this context makes the possibility of a switch in translators even more improbable.

Were it not for the fact that other considerations exist, we would be compelled to adopt one or other of these solutions. We have previously referred to the factors that led us to conclude that vv. 22b-23 represent a secondary insertion into the Hebrew text. This is consistent with the finding

<sup>(24)</sup> On the various meanings of the verb συνίστημι in the LXX, see J.A.L. LEE, "συνίστημι: A Sample Lexical Entry", *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography* (ed. T. MURAOKA) (Atlanta, GA 1990) 1-16. For the development of the meaning "to appoint" for the verb συνίστημι, see, *ibid.*, 11-12.

<sup>(25)</sup> See n. 7 above.

<sup>(26)</sup> In fact, the translation of v. 19 contains a form of double translation of the phrase וְצִוָּהוּ: καὶ ἐντέλῃ αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐντέλῃ περὶ αὐτοῦ. While this doubling is apparently a scribal error, it witnesses to variant attempts to translate the phrase וְצִוָּהוּ.

<sup>(27)</sup> The verb συνίστημι renders the verb צִוָּה one other time, in Num 32,28. LEE ("Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch", 11-12) considers that there, too, the meaning is "to appoint". WEVERS (*Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*, 154), on the other hand, argues for a variant meaning.

<sup>(28)</sup> See SEELIGMANN, "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research", 181-201; GOODING, *The Account of the Tabernacle*, 8-13; RABIN, "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint", 24.

that the Septuagintal text of vv. 22b-23 diverges from the verses which precede it. In light of these facts, we can suggest that the translator of vv. 22b-23 was not the same as the translator of the rest of the section on Joshua's investiture. This is probably due to the fact that the Hebrew text that lay before the initial translator did not include vv. 22b-23, making it impossible for him to have translated these verses. Only at a later stage, when this additional section became an accepted part of the Hebrew text, did another translator find the need to translate it and add it to the Septuagintal text. He focused on his mission to translate the additional Hebrew verses ignoring the meaningful differences between his translation and the previous translation. The differences in translation vocabulary between vv. 19-22a and vv. 22b-23, combined with the arguments regarding the textual status of vv. 22b-23, thus witness to a two-stage process of translation as a result of two stages in the composition of the Hebrew text.

The attempt to harmonize the Septuagintal text with that of the MT is a well-attested phenomenon, known both from the Septuagintal revisions and from a comparison of the Greek biblical scrolls from Qumran with the later Septuagint version<sup>(29)</sup>. It would appear that in our present case the addition of the translation of vv. 22b-23 came about through similar reasons. The recognition that the authoritative text included a passage not reflected in the Greek translation led to its addition in the Septuagint. The later translator did not adapt his new translation to the translation before him, however, but worked it anew. It is therefore possible to identify traces of his handiwork through his choice of vocabulary.

As stated above, on the basis of various factors I concluded that v. 19 was added to the pericope of Joshua's investiture in Numbers 27 at a later stage and that the description of the implementation in vv. 22b-23 was similarly absent from the original text of the passage. Our identification of two stages in the Greek translation enables us to gain a more precise insight into the development of the passage. According to the Septuagintal evidence, the description of the implementation was incorporated at a later stage than the addition of v. 19. The different translations of the verb צוה demonstrate that the addition of the description of the implementation was made by a translator other than that of v. 19. In light of these findings and conclusions, we are led to assume that v. 19 lay before the initial translator, whereas vv. 22b-23 did not exist in his version. In other words, the development of the text included a stage which contained v. 19 but not vv. 22b-23. We can thus conclude that the additions were made in two phases:

<sup>(29)</sup> See SEELIGMANN, "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research", 185; E.C. ULRICH, "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value", *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (eds. G.J. BROOKE – B. LINDARS) (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 33; Atlanta, GA 1992) 49-80; E. TOV, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis, PA 2001) 143-148; E. TOV, "The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean desert", *The Bible as Book. The Transmission of the Greek Text* (eds. S. MCKENDRICK – O.A. O'SULLIVAN) (London 2003) 97-122; S. KREUZER, "From 'Old Greek' to the Recensions: Who and What Caused the Change of the Hebrew Reference Text of the Septuagint?", *Septuagint Research. Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (eds. W. KRAUS – R.G. WOODEN) (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 53; Atlanta, GA 2006) 225-237.

v. 19 was added first, and at a later stage the description of the implementation in vv. 22b-23 was inserted.

This conclusion is further substantiated by a comparison of the order of the actions in the command section (vv. 18-20) and the implementation section (vv. 22-23). In the instructions given in v. 19, Moses is commanded to stand Joshua before Eleazar and the community and to appoint him, the instructions to carry out these two tasks being juxtaposed next to one another. In the description of the implementation in vv. 22-23, however, the two actions are separated by the description of Moses' leaning his hands on Joshua. If these two additions were carried out by one pen, how is the divergence in order to be explained?

It is reasonable to assume that the scribe who added the description of the implementation process in vv. 22b-23 reordered the actions according to a more rational sequence. He realized that the order of the actions in the section detailing the instructions is illogical. It is not clear why the instructions to stand Joshua before Eleazar and the entire community are only given in v. 19, following rather than preceding God's instructions to Moses to lean his hands upon Joshua. The scribe who added vv. 22b-23 placed the act of standing Joshua publicly before Eleazar and the entire community earlier, prior to God's instruction to Moses to lean his hands upon Joshua. It would appear that the difficulty raised by the order of the instructions regarding Joshua's investiture in vv. 18-20 lay, amongst other reasons, behind the addition of vv. 22b-23<sup>(30)</sup>. Thus v. 19 was already part of the text in front of the second interpolator when he added vv. 22b-23.

In summary, a change in vocabulary occurs between the instructions in v. 19 and the formulation in v. 22a, on the one hand, and the description of the implementation of the command in vv. 22b-23 on the other. Moreover, the translation of the verb צָנַח in v. 23 demonstrates that the translator accurately understood the unusual signification of this root in its particular context. In contrast, the stereotypical translation of this verb in v. 19 indicates that the translator of this verse did not comprehend the specific meaning of the root צָנַח carries in this verse. These findings, combined with additional literary-critical considerations, suggest that different translators were involved in the translation of these two sections and that it is unlikely that the first translator had vv. 22b-23 before him. Only once this section

<sup>(30)</sup> I hypothesized that v. 19 in its entirety was meant to be inserted before v. 18b, prior to the instructions to Moses to lean his hands upon Joshua. It was initially written in the margins of the text and subsequently mistakenly incorporated after v. 18b. It is not feasible to argue that the instruction to stand Joshua before Eleazar the priest and the entire community alone was intended to be placed before v. 18b and that in the Hebrew text which lay before the second interpolator the order of instructions in vv. 18-19 (before the second interpolator began his work) was in fact: Joshua's standing before Eleazar and the community, Moses' leaning of his hands, and Joshua's appointing as recorded in the description of the implementation process in vv. 22b-23. The formulation of the instructions regarding the commands to Joshua in v. 19 witnesses against such an assumption. V. 19 states וַיִּצְנַח מֹשֶׁה אֶת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לְעֵינֵיהֶם. The antecedents of the pronominal suffix of לְעֵינֵיהֶם are Eleazar and the entire community, who are referred to at the beginning of the verse. The instructions regarding the appointing thus originally followed immediately upon the instructions to stand Joshua before Eleazar the priest and the entire community, and cannot be separated from one another.

was added to the Hebrew text did it occur to a translator to insert a translation of it into the Septuagintal text. This explanation of the differences in the Greek translation concerning Joshua's investiture also deepens our understanding of the development of the Hebrew text. The study of the choice of vocabulary by the Greek translators thus adds to a literary-critical analysis of the biblical text itself.

Department of Bible  
University of Haifa, Israel

Itamar KISLEV

#### SUMMARY

A careful attention to the change in the employment of Greek equivalents in the translation of Hebrew words in the Septuagint may help us to identify involvement of different translators. Such a change may sometimes point to some stages in the composition of the Hebrew text. In this article some interesting differences in the vocabulary of the Septuagint in the passage of the investiture of Joshua in Num 27, 15-23 are examined and with some other literal-critical considerations lead to exact exploring of the literal process of the graduated formation of the Hebrew passage.

## **Blasphemy, Talion, and Chiasmus: The Marriage of Form and Content in Lev 24,13-23**

There is only one narrative in all of Lev 11–27. It is a brief narrative in Lev 24,10-12 that relates the story of a young man who “blasphemed the Name and cursed” during a fight. Moses and the people ask the Lord to advise them on how to deal with this offense, and the subsequent speech gives the divine response (24,13-23). The writer presents the report of the response as an extended chiasmus. “The inverted symmetry or reverse parallelism of this passage is engaging, impressive, extensive, and pleasing”<sup>(1)</sup>. Jacob Milgrom remarks that while the chiastic structure of this passage has long been recognized, the “ideological implications” of it have not been fully fathomed<sup>(2)</sup>. The present exposition intends to take us a little deeper than before, but does not pretend to fathom all the depths in this significant passage.

I will use Welch’s treatment of this passage as my starting-point, delineating the chiastic structure and linking it to one or two other dominant stylistic features; and then I will similarly develop some thoughts regarding interpretation, noting those that Welch lays out and adding a couple more. My initial goal is to affirm his conclusion that the use of chiasmus contributes significantly to the ideological message of the passage. Not only does the chiastic structure provide the literary means to develop and reinforce the legal principle of talion that lies at the heart of the divine decision, as Welch contends, but at the same time it illuminates the extreme gravity of the sin of blasphemy. The result is aesthetically pleasing at the literary level, but it also intends to facilitate the reader’s reception and implementation of the Lord’s verdict by reinforcing the talionic principle that the punishment fits the crime.

### *1. Chiastic Presentation of Lev 24,13-23 (MT)*

I have laid out the (unpointed) Masoretic text of Lev 24,13-23 in the adjoining chart, showing how I see the chiasmus in its various corresponding layers. The layer designated ‘I’ does not have a parallel because it constitutes the fulcrum of the chiasmus (24,20a). The translations in the discussion that follows are my own.

<sup>(1)</sup> J.W. WELCH, “Chiasmus in Biblical Law: An Approach to the Structure of Legal Texts in the Hebrew Bible”, *Jewish Law Association Studies IV: The Boston Conference Volume* (ed. B.S. JACKSON) (Atlanta, GA 1990) 8.

<sup>(2)</sup> J. MILGROM, *Leviticus 23–27* (AB; New York 2000) 2130. For some recent acknowledgements of the chiastic structure, see M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985) 101; G.J. WENHAM, *Leviticus* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1979) 312.



- A – וידבר יהוה אל־משה לאמר: (24,13)  
 B – הוצא את־המקל אל־מחוז למחנה וסמכו כל־השמים את־ידיהם  
 על־ראשו ורגמו אתו כל־העדה: (24,14)  
 C – ואל־בני ישראל תדבר לאמר (24,15a)  
 D – איש איש כ־יִקלל אֱלֹהֵיו ונשא חטאו: (24,15b)  
 E – ונקב שִׁסִּיהוּה מוֹת יוֹמָת רָגוּם יִרְגְּמוּרְבוּ כִלְהֵעֵדָה כֹּגֶר  
 כְּאוֹרֵחַ בִּנְקֻבֶּרֶשׁ יוֹמָת: (24,16)  
 F – ואִישׁ כִּי יִכֶּה כִלְנֶפֶשׁ אָדָם מוֹת יוֹמָת: (24,17)  
 G – וּמִכָּה נֶפֶשׁ־בְּהֵמָה יִשְׁלַמְנָה נֶפֶשׁ תַּחַת נֶפֶשׁ: (24,18)  
 H – ואִישׁ כִּדִּיתָן מוֹם בַּעֲמִיתוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה כֵן יִשְׁעָה לוֹ: (24,19)  
 I – שֹׁבֵר תַּחַת שֹׁבֵר עֵין תַּחַת עֵין שֵׁן תַּחַת שֵׁן (24,20a)  
 H' – כַּאֲשֶׁר יִתֵּן מוֹם בְּאָדָם כֵּן יִתֵּן לוֹ: (24,20b)  
 G' – וּמִכָּה בְּהֵמָה יִשְׁלַמְנָה (24,21a)  
 F' – וּמִכָּה אָדָם יוֹמָת: (24,21b)  
 E' – מִשְׁפָּח אֶחָד יִהְיֶה לָכֶם כֹּגֶר כְּאוֹרֵחַ יִהְיֶה (24,22a)  
 D' – כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם: (24,22b)  
 C' – וידבר משה אל־בני ישראל (24,23a)  
 B' – ויוציאו את־המקל אל־מחוז למחנה וירגמו אתו אֵבֶן (24,23b)  
 A' – ובני־ישראל עָשׂוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה: (24,23c)

Two clauses introduce two levels of direct address in the passage (vv. 13 and 15a). The first layer is the Lord's address to Moses alone, and the latter layer is what Moses is to pass on to the people. Some researchers restrict their analysis to the main speech in vv. 15-23a; but the mirroring of literary units actually entails the narrated introduction and conclusion (vv. 13-14 and 23bc; cf. Num 15,35-36). The triple iteration of the talion law in v. 20a is the fulcrum or hinge of the chiasmus, as eight juxtaposed pairs of statements surround the talionic law<sup>(3)</sup>. Each clause of the talion law proper constitutes the simplest chiastic form ("fracture for fracture, eye for eye, tooth for tooth"; v. 20a). The three syntactically identical clauses form a chiastic core of their own. The corresponding lines that make up each layer of the surrounding chiastic structure inherently reinforce the talion principle by echoing it stylistically. I will trace out these correspondences, moving outward from this inner crux, level by level. Then, I will comment on certain stylistic variations that expose aspects of the chiasmus that are significant for interpreting the message of the passage.

The chiastic layer lying closest to the triple iteration of the talion concerns injuries. It is balanced stylistically by a carefully coordinated use of the word "give" in vv. 19 and 20b (H + H'). The offense is described, most literally, in this way: "If a man gives an injury against his neighbor, just as he does thus it shall be done to him" (v. 19). The corresponding response in v. 20b collapses the two clauses of v. 19 with verbal and syntactical echoes, reading, "Just as he gives an injury to a human, thus it shall be given to him"<sup>(4)</sup>.

<sup>(3)</sup> Welch isolates one less layer. What he identifies as a single pair of parallel lines (vv. 24,15b-16 + 22), I split into two pairs of parallel lines (D + D' – v. 24,15b/v. 22b, and E + E' – v. 16/v. 22a; see below). Otherwise our delineation of the chiasmus is the same.

<sup>(4)</sup> Besides the use of *natan* in both lines, the writer repeats the alliterative sequence of particles (*ka'ašer* + *ken*) and the transition from active to passive verb forms.

The next two levels of the chiasmus (moving outward) concern the killing of an animal and the killing of a human, respectively ( $G + G' = \text{vv. } 18 + 21a, F + F' = \text{vv. } 17 + 21b$ ). The corresponding statements regarding the killing of an animal ( $G + G'$ ) identify the killer with the same participle (*makkeh*), both identify the victim as *behemah*, and both instruct the offender to “make restitution” (*yešallemennah*; vv. 18 and 21a). The two statements concerning homicide ( $F$  and  $F'$ ) follow a similar pattern, employing the same verb to describe the killer, identifying the victim with the same word in each statement, and using the same verb to describe the fate of the victim and the fate of the perpetrator.

The next layer in the chiasmus is the most imbalanced (vv. 16 and 22a;  $E$  and  $E'$ ). The only example of verbal correspondence comes in the phrase, “like alien, like native-born”. The explanation for this imbalance derives from the context of the passage, which will be demonstrated below. The identification of vv. 15b and 22b as an isolated layer in this chiasmus ( $D + D'$ ) is debatable (again, Welch joins this layer with the one just mentioned). I separate these lines from the adjoining layers by virtue of the juxtaposed use of “his God” (v. 15b) and “your God” (v. 22b). Verses 15b and 22b taken together essentially represent a synonymous parallel with the instructions of Lev 22,2 and Lev 22,32, both of which link a prohibition against profaning the Lord’s name (*hallel 'et šem*) with the common self-identification clause (“I am the Lord”; cp. 21,6. 8)<sup>(6)</sup>. Interpreters have debated the precise meaning of the instruction in 24,15b. Some take this as a statement of a general truth about any religion: “Anyone who curses his god [whether that god be the Lord or any other god] shall bear his sin”. In such an understanding, v. 16 follows v. 15b to specify that “bearing his sin” will entail death in the case of a worshiper of the Lord who curses the Lord<sup>(7)</sup>. I agree with a second group of interpreters that understand v. 15 more narrowly, regarding the prohibition against someone cursing “his god” as a direct reference to cursing the Lord<sup>(7)</sup>. The charge mentioned in the preceding narrative is that the man “blasphemed the name and cursed” (24,11). The repetition of the latter verb in the prohibition lends some support to the second interpretation, which sees the prohibition in v. 15b dealing specifically with the offense. The present suggestion that the phrase “anyone who curses his God” (v. 15b =  $D$ ) stands in chiasmic parallel to the phrase, “I am the Lord

<sup>(6)</sup> The writer uses two phrases in 24,11 to denote the man’s offense: he “blasphemes the Name (of the Lord)” and he “curses (his God)”. Both expressions appear in the narrative (v. 11) and in the law (vv. 15-16). The first verb (*naqab*) normally carries a rather neutral connotation of “mention” or “utter” (see Num 1,17; 1 Chr 16,41). It only conveys a derogatory meaning here because of its close association with “curse” (*qallel*). In verse 11 the two verbs form a compound predicate (“he blasphemed... and he cursed”), which probably is to be read as a hendiadys — for example, “he blasphemed in a curse” (NRSV), or “he pronounced by cursing blasphemously” (B. LEVINE, *Leviticus* [JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia, PA 1989] 166). In vv. 15-16 the same verbs are used in consecutive clauses, but their order has been reversed.

<sup>(6)</sup> For example, FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 101; J.E. HARTLEY, *Leviticus* (WBC 4; Dallas, TX 1992) 406; J. JOOSTEN, *People and Land in the Holiness Code* (Leiden 1996) 69.

<sup>(7)</sup> For example, MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23-27, 2115; E.S. GERSTENBERGER, *Leviticus* (OTL; Louisville, KY 1996) 362.

your God" (v. 22b = D'), adds weight to the second interpretation (again, see 21,6-8; 22,2.32). It implies that when the man "curses" his God he is clearly rejecting the divine assertion, "I am the Lord your God" (\*).

The correspondence between 24,15a and 24,23a is undeniable (C + C'). The word order is different, but the same verb and object are used, and v. 23a names the assumed subject of v. 15a. There is similar certitude in the pairing of vv. 14 and 23b (B + B'). The verbs and objects of both clauses in v. 23b match those in the first and third clauses of v. 14, as v. 23 reports the fulfillment of the directive given in v. 14. The earlier partner is longer because of the additional clause in the middle of v. 14, about placing hands on the perpetrator. The omission of this clause from v. 23 is puzzling, but interpreters generally assume that the people performed this act, as v. 14 requires (see the fulfillment notice in v. 23c).

The final clause of v. 23 rounds off the chiasmus by mentioning "the Lord" and "Moses" again, corresponding to the narrated introduction of v. 13, which states simply "the Lord spoke to Moses". The additional portion in v. 23 is the fulfillment notice ("the children of Israel did as the Lord had commanded Moses"). Similar fulfillment notices are prominent in the narrative sections interspersed in this central portion of the Torah, serving an important literary function in the final narrative block of Exodus (Exod 35,1.4.10.29; 36,1.5; 38,21-22; 39,1.5.7.21.26.29.31.32.42-43; 40,16.19.21.23.25.27.29.32), in the only other narrative section of Leviticus (Lev 8,5.9.13.17.21.29.31.34.36; 9,5.7.10.21; 10,15; cp. 10,1.5.7.18), and in the opening block of Numbers (Num 1,19.54; 2,33.34; 3,16.39.42.51; 4,37.41.45.49; 5,4; 8,3.20.22; 9,5.18.19.20.23). It is logical to conclude that a common author/redactor is responsible for all these narrative sections. The clause declares the obedience of the people, which is crucial to establishing and maintaining the sanctity of the cult. The act of cursing God threatens that sanctity, and this passage reports how the people successfully averted that threat.

In sum, all of Lev 24,13-23 forms a chiasmus, built around the *lex talionis*, which itself constitutes a simple syntactical chiasmus. The two outer layers of the chiasmus (A + A', B + B') constitute a legal decision and its execution in their own right, and the six inner layers illustrate in repetitive literary form the legal principle that lies at the core of that decision, the *lex talionis*.

(\*) Many interpreters assume that the blasphemer in this episode is considered an "alien", and that one purpose of the law is to establish that aliens — like this man — are to be punished just like native-born Israelites in cases of blasphemy (e.g., WELCH, "Chiasmus in Biblical Law", 11-12). However, the Israelite identification of the man's mother might intend to identify him as Israelite as well. This was certainly the case in post-exilic Judea. It is not certain that the people consider this man an "alien", much less a "foreigner". More to the point, it is not certain that they already know how to respond if an Israelite curses God, and that now they are wondering how to respond when an alien commits such an offense. That could be the case, but we cannot be certain. In any case, the law is stated broadly enough to show that this individual is subject to it.

## 2. Other Stylistic Considerations

Despite the general symmetry provided by the chiasmic structure of the passage, there is a consistent imbalance to the speech, particularly in its four inner layers. The part just prior to the central fulcrum (v. 19 = H) consists of a main clause with “give” (*natan*) as the main verb, followed by a subordinate clause (“just as...”) that contains the active and passive forms of the same verb (“do”). The corresponding line in v. 20b (H') is shorter. It collapses the two clauses of v. 19 and consists solely of a subordinate clause that contains the active and passive forms of “give”.

We find a different sort of imbalance in the next layer out (vv. 18 and 21a, lines G and G'). The object is identified as “the life of an animal” in the earlier line, but the latter line speaks more simply of one smiting “an animal”. Also, the earlier statement is supplemented with the talionic phrase, “life for life” (v. 18), but the phrase is absent from the corresponding line in v. 21a. The next layer (F + F') is imbalanced in a slightly different way. The object is identified by the fuller expression, “the life of a human”, in the earlier line (v. 17), while the latter line speaks more simply of “a human”; this matches the style of the adjoining layer (just mentioned). Similarly, the verbs provide a shift that is parallel to the adjoining layer, as the writer expresses the verb of judgment with an intensive infinitive in v. 17 (“he shall surely be put to death”), but there is only a simple verb in the corresponding line (v. 21b — “he shall be put to death”).

This brings us to the greatest imbalance of the entire chiasmus, the imbalance between v. 16 and v. 22a (E and E'). The only direct correspondence between the two pieces involves the brief comparison clause (“like alien, like citizen”). This means that the clause, “You shall have one judgment”, in v. 22a is structurally equivalent to everything but the comparison clause in v. 16. Verse 16 contains two intensive infinitive constructions (“[he] shall surely die” and “[they] shall surely stone him”), followed by a comparison clause and then a simple reiteration of the initial verb clause (“[he] shall die”). The chiasmic structure of the whole speech shows that the brief statement about “one judgment” in v. 22a serves as a structural parallel and summation of the much longer dual judgment prescriptions and the abbreviated reiteration in v. 16 (E + E').

The literary features of the expanded statement in v. 16 are significant, because they actually push the reader forward, toward the center of the chiasmus. The expansion in v. 16 consists of an intensive infinitive construction (“he shall surely be put to death”), supplemented by a second intensive infinitive (“they shall surely stone him”), and then recapitulated by the simple form of the first verb (“he shall be put to death”). These features point the reader toward the next two layers of the chiasmus because the pattern of movement from intensive verb to regular verb — “he shall surely be put to death” // “he shall be put to death” — constitutes a primary component of the chiasmic structuring of those layers (vv. 17 and 21b; F and F'). Just as the E + E' layer points toward the inner layers of the chiasmus, so the statement in the F + F' layer points the reader inward, toward the chiasmic core of the pericope. The literary style is significant secondly because v. 16 uses two intensive infinitives in addressing most directly the reason for this

speech. The simple phrase, “You will have one judgment”, in v. 21 reminds the reader that the purpose of this chiastic speech is to provide a judgment for an offense, and it points back to v. 16 as that judgment. The double use of the intensive reflects the seriousness of the offense and the certitude of the judgment. Meanwhile, the direct repetition of the comparison clause recalls an immediate issue in this particular case. That issue is the matter of application: whether the law applies to non-Israelites living among them. The text answers with a resounding affirmative, but by directing the reader toward the inner core of the pericope, it bases that judgment on the core principle of talion, not on a pre-existing judgment used by the Israelites.

The overall structure of the chiasmus places the talionic principle at the center, but it then proceeds from the principle outward in steps of ever-increasing import. One can recognize the logic of the arrangement by viewing (again) the chiasmus from the center and moving out. The layers ripple out from the talionic core, moving from permanent injury (“blemish”) to death of an animal to death of a human. The progression is from less serious offense (at the center) to more serious offense. The placement of “life for life” (v. 18) away from the central three examples of talion (v. 20a) supports this understanding of the pericope’s progression, and the triple iteration of the talion principle at the middle of the chiasmus affirms it. The core principle is equitable reciprocity.

It is helpful to recognize how the presentation of talion in this passage is different from the presentation in the two other passages that delineate the talion principle (Exod 21,23-25; Deut 19,21). Those passages begin with “life for life” and proceed to “eye for eye” and “tooth for tooth”, and then they continue in a descending order on the body, and from body parts that are lost to those that are only scarred. The sequence of three clauses at the fulcrum of the present passage (Lev 24,20a) breaks from this sequence and mentions only bodily injuries. The core principle is “injury for injury”, repeated three times. This allows the three clauses to function together as the fulcrum of the chiasmus and the starting-point for applying the talion principle. One moves from the basic principle to its application in more serious offenses, first with matters of life, and then on to the matter of blasphemy of the Divine Name.

\*  
\* \* \*

Welch identifies six ways in which the chiastic form of this passage enhances the deeper message it intends to convey: (1) it gives a sense of completion to the story, (2) it emphasizes the importance of obedience to a divine command, (3) it promotes the internalization of the command by placing it within a real-life event, (4) it provides a helpful mnemonic device, (5) it “enhance[s] the moral imperative” of the judgment, and (6) it reinforces the impression that God’s decision here is fair and just. The recognition that the organizing principle of the chiasmus is from the center outward reinforces this last observation, because it reveals that the ideational progression of the pericope is from lesser offense (at the center) to greater offense. The chiastic center of the divine directive is the triple talion statement concerning injury. The seriousness of the offenses increases as one moves out from that center, from injury to the killing of an animal to the killing of a human. Cursing God

is regarded as a more serious offense than murder (see Matt 12,31). This progression exposes the ultimate magnitude of blasphemy, because it is the outermost offense presented in the chiasmus. It seems, then, that the primary goal of the passage is to clarify the gravity of the sin of blasphemy and/or cursing.

There is hardly any mention of blasphemy in ancient Near Eastern texts, and I am aware of only one that refers in an indirect way to the sort of punishment one might expect for such an offense<sup>(9)</sup>. The present text strongly implies that “cursing Yahweh” is to be regarded as a graver offense than murder. Murder is an affront against a life, but it is likely that, in the writer’s mind, cursing the Lord is an affront against life itself. The Lord is the creator and sustainer of life. To mention his “name” is to recall all that he is and all that he has done. It is to recall his life-giving essence (implied in Gen 1–2, especially 2,7; cf. 9,4–6; Job 12,10; 27,3; 33,4), and it is to recall his mighty acts that provide and sustain life (again, for example, note the oft-repeated clause, “I am the Lord...” in Lev 18–22). To curse the Lord is to reject who he is and what he does. It is to deny his essence and his power, and it is to refute the reality of his life-giving and holy acts<sup>(10)</sup>.

At the same time, the use of chiasmus to verbalize the judgment and its underlying principle suggests to the reader that the prescribed response to the offense is balanced and therefore reasonable. The structural balance in the corresponding phrases throughout the literary unit mirrors the moral balance of the legal response to the offense. Thus, the writer has chosen a literary style for this unit that reinforces the legal principle that lies at the heart of the unit and the sense of inherent justice that intends to permeate the divine judgment in this case.

Religion Division  
Pepperdine University  
Malibu, CA 90263, USA

Timothy M. WILLIS

## SUMMARY

The verbal divine response to a case of blasphemy/cursing of God is presented as a lengthy chiasmus in Lev 24,13–23. One aspect of this that has gone unnoticed is how the structure suggests that blasphemy is a more serious offense than murder. This observation shows how the pericope fits well thematically in Lev 18–26, where there are repeated examples of the divine self-declaration formulas (“I am the Lord...”) and references to holiness.

<sup>(9)</sup> MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23–27, 2120.

<sup>(10)</sup> For some similar conclusions, see S.E. BALENTINE, *Leviticus* (Interpretation; Louisville, KY 2002) 188–190.

## Psalm 132: Zion's Well-Being

Psalm 132 is a text which, in view of its content and its place in the psalter, must have been important to the religious community of Zion. What exactly is the purport of this text? What was its function in religious life? To find an answer to these questions, different aspects of the psalm will be investigated.

### I

Considered from a formal point of view, Psalm 132 is a well ordered composition. It can be described as follows.

In vv. 1.10.11 and 17 the name of David is found. The repetition can be taken as a twofold inclusion, arguing a division in two main parts: vv. 1-10 and vv. 11-18. There are data to confirm this division. First, both parts consist of 10 distichs precisely. Secondly, an oath is mentioned at the beginning of both. Thirdly, vv. 1-10 are in the main prayers and exhortations, vv. 11-18 mainly words of YHWH in quotation. Some take vv. 11-12 as a further ground (after v. 10a) for the prayer in v. 10b<sup>(1)</sup>. In their view, the text means to say, Do not repudiate your anointed one, since God has made a promise to David. The transition from second to third person ('your' — 'YHWH') does not favour this reading. Another reason to reject it is the connection between vv. 11-12 and the verses following them. I will return to this point.

There is a special relationship between vv. 8-10 and vv. 13-18, to the effect that the prayers of vv. 8, 9 and 10 are answered in vv. 13-14, 15-16 and 17-18 respectively. The relative length of the answering passages is in harmony with their content, indicating a generous measure. In v. 8 YHWH is asked to rise up to his resting place; vv. 13-14 declare that he desires Zion as his resting place forever. Verse 9a is a prayer for the 'righteousness' (צדק) that can make the priestly service salutary (cf. צדק in Isa 11,5; Job 29,14); in v. 16a YHWH says that he himself will invest the priests with salvation (ישע). In v. 9b it is asked that in Zion<sup>(2)</sup> YHWH's faithful may shout for joy; in vv. 15.16b Zion is given the prospect of lavish material blessing (ברך אברך, inf. abs.) and exuberant jubilation (רנן ירנן, inf. abs. again). In v. 10 God is asked for the sake of David not to reject his 'anointed one'; in vv. 17-18 royal welfare and victory are promised in David abundantly.

External parallelism and the pattern of textual coherence suggest strophes of alternately two and three verses for the first part of the text (vv. 1-2.3-5, etc.), strophes of two verses for the second (vv. 11.12.13-14, etc.). This division is supported by the relation, mentioned above, between vv. 8-10 and vv. 13-18, and the repetition of words in corresponding positions (לאביר יעקב,

<sup>(1)</sup> Thus e.g. F. DELITZSCH, *Biblischer Commentar über die Psalmen* (Leipzig 1883) 813; E.J. KISSANE, *The Book of Psalms*. Translated from a Critically Revised Hebrew Text. With a Commentary (Dublin 1953-1954) II, 273; J. SCHREINER, *Sion-Jerusalem, Jahwes Königssitz*. Theologie der Heiligen Stadt im Alten Testament (München 1963) 103.

<sup>(2)</sup> See v. 16 and the use of חסיד, 'faithful', in Ps 50,5; 52,11; 116,15; 149,1-2.

'to/for the Strong One of Jacob', vv. 2.5; לְכַסֵּא־לְךָ, 'on the throne for you', vv. 11b.12b; יָשֵׁב, 'sit, reside', with עַד־יָעִיד, 'forever', vv. 12b.14)<sup>(5)</sup>.

## II

Several of the local references in Psalm 132 need explanation.

Apart from Ps 132,6, Jaar (יַעַר, 'Forest'), or possibly Sedé-Jaar (שְׂדֵי־יַעַר, 'Fields of the Forest'), is not found as a place-name. It is understood, generally, as a designation of Kiriath-Jearim, the place where the ark was after its return from the land of the Philistines (1 Sam 7,1)<sup>(6)</sup>. This explanation is plausible, as it is supported by v. 8 and suits the overall meaning of the psalm.

In v. 7 YHWH's מְשֻׁכָּנָה, 'dwelling place', is mentioned. Since מְשֻׁכָּנָה, as a plural, suggests greatness<sup>(7)</sup>, the housing of the ark in Kiriath-Jearim can hardly be meant<sup>(8)</sup>. The same may apply to the tent pitched for the ark by David (2 Sam 6,17; 1 Kgs 8,1)<sup>(9)</sup>; and anyhow, as a provisional dwelling this tent is unlikely to be named YHWH's מְנוּחָה, 'resting place' (v. 8). It has been argued that in vv. 7 and 8 the reference is to different places, 'dwelling place' (v. 7) referring to the tent in the city of David, 'resting place' (v. 8) to the temple (cf. 1 Chr 28,2: בֵּית מְנוּחָה)<sup>(10)</sup>. This view, however, complicates the reading of the text, as it implies an act of entering between the call of v. 7 and that of v. 8. The most natural assumption is apparently that in v. 7, as in v. 5, מְשֻׁכָּנָה refers to the 'place' (מָקוֹם) that David pledged to find.

Verse 7b has the phrase הָרָם רַגְלָיו, 'footstool'. In 1 Chr 28,2 'footstool' seems to be a designation of the ark. As such, it is not illogical, because the cherubim are YHWH's throne: the ark beneath it could be considered his footstool. However, when in Psalm 132 the 'footstool' is mentioned, the ark is clearly outside the sanctuary. In addition, it has a different function here,

<sup>(5)</sup> Cf. P. VAN DER LUGT, *Strofische structuren in de Bijbels-Hebreeuwse poëzie*. De geschiedenis van het onderzoek en een bijdrage tot de theorievorming omtrent de strofenbouw van de Psalmen (Kampen 1980) 420-422; J.P. FOKKELMAN, *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible*. At the Interface of Prosody and Structural Analysis (Assen 1998-2004) III, 298-299.

<sup>(6)</sup> Kiriath-Baal and Baalah are also, according to Josh 15,9.60; 18,14, names for Kiriath-Jearim. For a survey of opinions on אֶפְרַתָּה and שְׂדֵי־יַעַר see A. ROBINSON, "Do Ephrathah and Jaar Really Appear in Psalm 132?", *ZAW* 86 (1974) 220-221.

<sup>(7)</sup> See W. GESENIUS – E. KAUTZSCH, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1909) § 124a.b.e.

<sup>(8)</sup> Contra R. KITTEL, *Die Psalmen*. Übersetzt und erklärt (KAT XIII; Leipzig – Erlangen 1922) 405 (translating v. 7 in past tense, p. 404). O. EISSFELDT, "Psalm 132", *WdO* 2 (1954-1959) 481-482, reads vv. 6-9 as a quotation from an older poem. In view of the correspondence between vv. 8-10 and vv. 13-18, however, the sayings of vv. 8-10 must be on the same temporal level. Eissfeldt's interpretation takes no account of this.

<sup>(9)</sup> The view that מְשֻׁכָּנָה refers to this tent is found in DELITZSCH, *Psalmen*, 812 (cf. p. 809); T.E. FRETHEIM, "Psalm 132: a Form-Critical Study", *JBL* 86 (1967) 294-295; A. LAATO, "Psalm 132 and the Development of the Jerusalemite/Israelite Royal Ideology", *CBQ* 54 (1992) 65-66.

<sup>(10)</sup> This opinion is held in two variants. Delitzsch and Laato think that in the situation from which the psalm was born the tent still existed. In Fretheim's opinion it existed imaginarily, "just as the ark is understood to be in Kiriath-jearim, in the actualization of the cult" (n. 40 on p. 297).



representing YHWH's strength (v. 8; cf. Ps 24,7-10; 68,2-3.19). As in other texts, the 'footstool' must be mount Zion (see Ps 99,5.9; cf. Isa 60,13; Ezek 43,7; Lam 2,1).

Verse 13 has the word מוֹשֵׁב, 'habitation'. Because the מִשְׁכָּנֹת and the מוֹשֵׁב are both a מְנוּחָה as well (vv. 8.14), different places can scarcely be intended, once again. The two words, however, have different connotations. A מוֹשֵׁב is a habitation in the general sense. The word מִשְׁכָּן, on the other hand, is mostly found in cultic contexts. In priestly texts it is the technical term for the tabernacle; in the psalms YHWH's מִשְׁכָּנֹת is the place where, on his 'holy mountain' (Ps 43,3), the faithful may enter his courts (Ps 84,2-3).

According to v. 13 YHWH has desired Zion for his 'habitation' (מוֹשֵׁב). In view of v. 17 locating David's welfare in Zion and v. 15 mentioning Zion's provisions and poor people, 'Zion' cannot be just the temple area. The name apparently refers to the city, Jerusalem (cf. Ps 48,2-3). So this is the 'place' (מָקוֹם) that David found, YHWH's 'dwelling place' (מִשְׁכָּנֹת), his 'habitation' (מוֹשֵׁב) and 'resting place' (מְנוּחָה).

### III

Passages dealing with David, David's house, the rule of this house, and its justification ask for some special attention.

Verse 11b reads literally, "From your fruit-of-the-womb (פְּרִי בִטְנִי) I will set upon the throne for you". The phrase 'fruit of the womb', with a masculine pronominal suffix as in e.g. Deut 7,13, stands for 'offspring'. The preposition מִן, 'from', used in partitive sense, could in itself regard one or more descendants (cf. מִן in Ezek 17,13 and Exod 16,27 respectively). The continuation of the text — with 'your sons' and the sons of these sons — is reason to think of the latter. The phrase לִכְסֹא־לְךָ, 'on the throne for you' ('on your throne'), reflects the notion that the reign of David's sons will be in a sense David's reign<sup>(9)</sup>.

There are two reasons to understand כִּי, in v. 13, as 'for', not 'truly'. First, the position of the particle in this text is not one of those in which its sense is clearly and exclusively emphatic<sup>(10)</sup>. Second, if כִּי is rendered by 'for', Zion's election can be understood as a pre-condition for the durability of the Davidic reign. On this understanding, as we will see, the second main part of the psalm is in agreement with the first.

Verses 17 and 18 describe in full splendour the royal well-being. In v. 17 the first stich and the second complement one another. As the horn is a symbol of power and pride (see e.g. 1 Sam 2,1.10; Ps 75,5-6.11), the statement about the horn sprouting up means to say that YHWH will make David's kingship strong and proud. The lamp, 'prepared' (עֲרֵךְ) by provision of oil and a wick, is a symbol of lasting existence (see e.g. 2 Sam 21,17; Prov

<sup>(9)</sup> P. JOÜON — T. MURAOKA, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Roma 1991) § 130g. For לִי שֵׁית see Ps 21,4.

<sup>(10)</sup> Cf. T. MURAOKA, *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem — Leiden 1985) 158-164. In the sense of 'truly' כִּי is used in oath formulae, in the apodosis of conditional sentences, and in poetic texts right before the predicate (p. 164).

24,20)<sup>(11)</sup>. 'Preparing a lamp for the anointed one' is: conferring on him a lasting kingship. Often, in poetic texts, the alternation of perfect and imperfect is hardly indicative of relations in time. Occurring between the seven imperfects of vv. 15-18, the perfect in v. 17b (עָרַכְתִּי, 'I prepare' or 'have prepared') is noticeable nevertheless. In v. 13 the perfect is used with regard to the election of Zion (בָּחַר... בָּ, 'he chooses' or 'has chosen'; אָוָה, 'he desires her' or 'has desired her'). The election of Zion and the founding of a lasting kingship seem to be acts of the same rank. So in v. 17, in accordance with the parallelism, the 'anointed one' is clearly David, and the glory described in v. 18 is David's glory. The descendants, however, continuing David's kingship (v. 11), share in the ancestor's well-being.

#### IV

The content of Psalm 132 may be described as follows. The first main part of the text is essentially a prayer. It recalls David's self-sacrifice: that he denied himself all rest and comfortable living in order to find a place that could please his God as a dwelling (vv. 2-5). YHWH is asked to 'remember' this in David's favour, that is, honour it, reward it (זָכַר with ל, v. 1). Verse 10 complements the opening verse. David's hardships, if 'remembered before YHWH', will benefit his descendant, the present king. YHWH will not reject him, 'turning away' his face (הָשִׁיב פָּנָיו, cf. 1 Kgs 2,16-17,20), but will 'look at his face' (הִבִּיט פָּנָיו, Ps 84,10). A pre-condition of this favour is, however, that YHWH accepts the place which the ancestor longed to find him<sup>(12)</sup>. Therefore, after a liturgical introduction (vv. 6-7), YHWH is asked to 'stand up' to his resting place, Zion. If he is ready to do so, Zion will be a place of well-being (cf. Ps 133,3); its priests will be able to good ministration and its faithful will rejoice. The second part of the psalm is an answer. It recalls the unchanging pledge that God made to David and the condition added to it: "If your sons keep my covenant and my decrees that I shall teach them, their sons also, forevermore, shall sit on your throne" (v. 12). This dynastic continuity is grounded on YHWH's choice of Zion as his permanent dwelling: "For (כִּי) YHWH has chosen Zion (...): 'This is my resting place forever (...)' " (vv. 13-14). The last part of the psalm sums up the blessings of Zion's election: blessings of food, salvation, joy, and royal glory.

There is a close connection between the inner organization of the text and its formal structure. Three links are to be noted. The first is David's name encompassing both main parts of the psalm. In both parts David is essential. The second link is the correspondence between vv. 8-10 and vv. 13-18, both of which first bring up God's dwelling in Zion, then the welfare of Zion's priests and faithful, and finally the well-being of David's house. These are the things that Psalm 132 is about. Thirdly, there is the repetition of the root יָשַׁב, 'sit, reside', with עַד-עַד, 'forever', underlining the

<sup>(11)</sup> The background of the metaphor is not likely to be a lamp that is always lit or is lit all night, indicating that the house is occupied. See K. GALLING, "Die Beleuchtungsgeräte im israelitisch-jüdischen Kulturgebiet", *ZDPV* 46 (1923) 33-37.

<sup>(12)</sup> Cf. FRETHEIM, "Psalm 132", 298.

connection between the durability of the Davidic rule and the election, forever, of Zion<sup>(13)</sup>.

V

In Psalm 132 the community of Zion seeks the favour of YHWH on behalf of Zion's welfare; it does so by acts and by words. One has the impression that the words are highly important. Yet, obviously, the psalm has been composed for a ritual event.

The shape of this event can be deduced from the temporal structure of the first part of the text. In v. 10 David is distinguished from the 'anointed one', the present king. So, evidently, the prayer 'in favour of David' (v. 1) was spoken after David's reign<sup>(14)</sup>. Words of David are quoted in vv. 3-5. This quotation is followed by a statement which is clearly not its continuation and is not announced as a new quotation either. Since elsewhere in the psalm all quotative statements have some form of introduction (vv. 2.11a.13), the statement in v. 6 is apparently, from a temporal point of view, on one level with the prayers in vv. 1 and 8-10. So, for the audience of the psalm, this statement concerned a present situation and YHWH's 'dwelling place', in v. 7, must be Zion indeed. After the quotation in vv. 3-5, however, 'Fields of Jaar', as a designation of Kiriath-Jearim or its vicinity, is apt to suggest David's time as well. From Kiriath-Jearim (1 Chr 13,6; cf. 1 Sam 7,1)<sup>(15)</sup>, on David's initiative, the ark was 'brought up' to Jerusalem. The assumption that in our text it is the ark which was 'found' in the 'Fields of Jaar' is confirmed by v. 8. 'Ephrathah' is a variant form of Ephrath<sup>(16)</sup>. It is likely here to refer to the area in which the village of Ephrathah was situated as well as Bethlehem Ephrathah<sup>(17)</sup>. It is quite plausible that in this neighbourhood one might have learned that the ark was in Kiriath-Jearim. The place was part of the same region (cf. 1 Chr 2,50).

Now how could, to the audience of the psalm, the statement of v. 6 be present and past at the same time? I think the answer can only be that the words belong to an act presenting a past event, which act must have been then a dramatic ritual. This also answers the question why in v. 6 the ark is not mentioned: it is the centre of the ritual and so all eyes are upon it<sup>(18)</sup>. The

<sup>(13)</sup> In Ps 132 YHWH's favour to David presupposes the election of Zion. In the Deuteronomistic history, however, it is an election in itself (see 1 Sam 16,3.10.12; 2 Sam 6,21; 1 Kgs 11,34), which even precedes the choice of Jerusalem (1 Kgs 8,16). The mention of Jerusalem in 1 Kgs 11,13.32 seems to originate from the idea, represented by the psalm, that YHWH's favour to David and Jerusalem's election belong together essentially.

<sup>(14)</sup> The prayers in Ps 132 may have been recited by the king himself; see esp. Ps 2,7; 84,9-10. Cf. Th. BOUL, "Psalm lxxxiv, a Prayer of the Anointed", VT 44 (1994) 433-441.

<sup>(15)</sup> The text handed down in 1 Chr 13,6 is to be preferred to that of 2 Sam 6,2. See S.R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford 1913) 265-266.

<sup>(16)</sup> Cf. H. BAUER – P. LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Halle 1922) 528s.t.

<sup>(17)</sup> See Gen 35,16.19 (in v. 19 the concluding words are clearly a gloss); 1 Sam 10,2; 17,12; Jer 31,15; Mic 5,1; 1 Chr 2,19.50-51; 4,4. Cf. DELITZSCH, *Psalmen*, 812; J. BLENKINSOPP, "Kiriath-Jearim and the Ark", JBL 88 (1969) 153-156.

<sup>(18)</sup> A similar phenomenon may occur where no ritual is to be supposed; see Ps

announcement in v. 6 opens with הִנֵּה: “Behold, we heard of it (...), we found it (...)”<sup>(19)</sup>. Statements opening in this way can be the introduction to an appeal, as is the case in Gen 16,6; 42,2; 1 Sam 9,6,24; 1 Kgs 20,31; 2 Kgs 4,9-10; 6,1-2<sup>(20)</sup>. The idea common to these texts is: Such being the state of affairs, this can be done. Verses 6-7 of our psalm, taken similarly, make good sense: ‘We have found it, so let us go in’. However, entering into Zion to worship there (v. 7) is futile if the place that David swore to ‘find’ is not accepted now by YHWH. This is the notion behind v. 8: “Rise up, YHWH, to your resting place, you and the ark of your strength!” Israel’s God, awful to his enemies, is asked to ‘rise up’ to the place<sup>(21)</sup> where, after war and wanderings, he lives with his people in peace (cf. Num 10,35; Ps 68,2; 95,11; also 1 Kgs 8,20-21.56).

## VI

Since the Davidic king and the ark are part of the situation supposed in Psalm 132, the text must be pre-exilic<sup>(22)</sup>. This is also indicated by the quotation in vv. 3-5. A Sumerian song records about king Gudea of Lagash, “To build a house for his King (the deity), he does not sleep during the night, not slumber on the midday”<sup>(23)</sup>. In Egyptian royal inscriptions it is recorded that the ruler passes the night watchful, meditating what might serve the deity. This usually results in building a temple<sup>(24)</sup>. So, when David says that he will give himself no rest until he finds a place where his God may dwell, this suits a traditional model of royal behaviour; the author of the psalm appears to have been familiar at the royal court. A further indication is the position of our text among the Songs of Ascent. Linguistic elements and late formulae argue most

107,25.29; 111,10; 144,6. The word אָרֹן (‘chest, ark’), generally masculine, is feminine in 1 Sam 4,17; 2 Chr 8,11. In Ps 132 the feminine suffix is probably to distinguish the ark as a symbol from YHWH himself (cf. v. 8).

<sup>(19)</sup> For שָׁמַע as ‘hear about, hear of’ see e.g. Jer 19,3; Job 42,5.

<sup>(20)</sup> Cf. F. BROWN – S.R. DRIVER – C.A. BRIGGS, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1951) s.v., b (a) (p. 244).

<sup>(21)</sup> For the pregnant use of לָּ see Gen 19,1; Esth 7,7. D.R. HILLERS, “Ritual Procession of the Ark and Ps 132”, *CBQ* 30 (1968) 48-55, reads לָּ as ‘from’. It is doubtful whether in classical Hebrew לָּ could have that meaning. E.F. HUWILER, “Patterns and Problems in Psalm 132”, *The Listening Heart. Essays in Wisdom and the Psalms in Honor of Roland E. Murphy* (ed. K.G. HOGLUND a.o.) (Sheffield 1987) 204, understands לָּ as ‘for the sake of, on behalf of’. In that sense, however, it is generally used with respect to humans; see C. BROCKELMANN, *Hebräische Syntax* (Neukirchen 1956) § 107e; P. JOÜON – T. MURAOKA, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Roma 1991) § 133d. If ‘for the sake of’ were meant in v. 8, it would rather have been expressed by בְּעַד (2 Sam 10,12), עַל (Judg 9,17), עַל אֲדִידָא (Exod 18,8), or עַל דְּבַר (Ps 45,5).

<sup>(22)</sup> A later dating is defended in e.g. F. BAETHGEN, *Die Psalmen. Übersetzt und erklärt* (HK II/2; Göttingen 1904) 390-391; C.A. BRIGGS – E. G. BRIGGS, *The Book of Psalms* (ICC; Edinburgh 1906-1907) II, 468-469; M. BUTTENWIESER, *The Psalms*. Chronologically treated, with a new translation (1938, New York 1969) 381-382; K. SEYBOLD, *Die Psalmen* (HAT I/15; Tübingen 1996) 497; M. SAUR, *Die Königpsalmen*. Studien zur Entstehung und Theologie (BZAW 340; Berlin – New York 2004) 225-248.

<sup>(23)</sup> See A. FALKENSTEIN – W. VON SODEN, *Sumerische und Akkadische Hymnen und Gebete*. Eingeleitet und übertragen (Zürich – Stuttgart 1953) 154.

<sup>(24)</sup> See B.G. OCKINGA, “An Example of Egyptian Royal Phraseology in Psalm 132”, *BN* 11 (1980) 38-42.

of these texts to be post-exilic. Psalm 132, however, is by its size, language, verse rhythm (3+3 accents) and *parallelismus membrorum* perfectly classical<sup>(25)</sup>.

It is not very plausible that Psalm 132 should stem from the early monarchic period<sup>(26)</sup>. The condition attached to YHWH's pledge to David in v. 12 can hardly stem from an early time, because it is not found in 2 Sam 7 nor even in Ps 89<sup>(27)</sup>. Verse 12, moreover, seems to anticipate a considerable succession of Davidic rulers. The purport of the psalm points in the same direction. As its prayers touch matters that were vital to the kingdom of Judah, it fits in with a time when the Judaeon state was in danger<sup>(28)</sup>. In the context of a time like that, elements of the text stand out very clearly indeed. In v. 8 the phrase 'ark of your strength' was chosen well. In v. 10 the appeal on behalf of the king is urgent. And the alarming 'If...' in v. 12 cannot be silenced by the exuberant statements on Zion and David that will follow.

## VII

In the seventh month, at the end of the crop year, the great festival of YHWH, Sukkoth, was celebrated in Jerusalem<sup>(29)</sup>. There are two reasons to assume that Psalm 132 originates from this festival. First, to the religious community Sukkoth was the peak of the year, and so it suits a text dealing with matters essential to this community. Second, in the account of the inauguration of Solomon's temple (1 Kgs 8) the ark ritual is linked with

<sup>(25)</sup> Cf. J.M. AUWERS, "Le Psaume 132 parmi les graduels", *RB* 103 (1996) 558. With regard to the psalm's language, it is illustrative that while the particle  $\varpi$  is found nine times in the Songs of Ascent,  $\varpi$  occurs, apart from Ps 132,2, only in Ps 127,5.

<sup>(26)</sup> See for this early dating SCHREINER, *Sion-Jerusalem*, 174; also H. GESE, "Der Davidsbund und die Zionserwählung", *ZThK* N.F. 61 (1964) 16; LAATO, "Development", *CBQ* 54 (1992) 49-66. A later pre-exilic dating is advocated in e.g. H. GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen*. Übersetzt und erklärt (Göttingen 1926) 568; W.O.E. OESTERLEY, *The Psalms*. Translated with text-critical and exegetical notes (London 1955) 530; W.R. TAYLOR in *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York – Nashville, TN 1951-1957) IV, 685.

<sup>(27)</sup> A. LAATO, "Psalm 132: A Case Study in Methodology", *CBQ* 61 (1999) 28-29 (cf. LAATO, "Development", 52-54), takes the view that the Deuteronomist reformulated the condition expressed in Ps 132,11-12 as "a conditional promise concerning the Davidides' rule over the whole of Israel, including the northern region"; the threat implied in the condition was thought to have been realized in the secession of northern Israel. This reading of relevant Deuteronomistic texts is at variance with 1 Kgs 9,6-9, where the judgement on disloyalty reaches far beyond the end of the united monarchy. In Laato's view the Deuteronomistic history has two versions of YHWH's promise to David, one, conditional, regarding the throne of Israel, the other, unconditional, regarding the kingship in Jerusalem. Indeed, obviously, there is an unconditional promise in 2 Sam 7; Jerusalem, however, is not mentioned in it. In the book of Kings there is only a conditional promise (1 Kgs 2,4; 8,25). The threat implied in it takes effect because of Solomon's sins (1 Kgs 11,9-11,31), but for the sake of David and Jerusalem, and despite more disloyalty, it is carried out only in part (1 Kgs 11,13.32.36; 15,4-5; 2 Kgs 8,19). From an historical viewpoint, it seems plausible that after bad governance (see 2 Kgs 23,26-27; 24,3-4), in times when the Davidic reign was in danger, an unconditional promise could be modified into a conditional one (Ps 132 etc.; cf., however, Ps 89).

<sup>(28)</sup> Thus Melody D. KNOWLES, "The Flexible Rhetoric of Retelling: The Choise of David in the Texts of the Psalms", *CBQ* 67 (2005) 246-247.

<sup>(29)</sup> See Lev 23,39; Deut 16,13-15; Neh 7,72-8,18; also Exod 23,16; 34,22.

Sukkoth. We are told that at the festival in the seventh month the elders of Israel came by order of the king 'to bring up' (להעלות) the ark of the covenant of YHWH, that is, bring it to its place in YHWH's house (vv. 1-6; cf. vv. 65-66). The idea that in pre-exilic times, on certain occasions, the ark was brought solemnly to the temple has been discredited somewhat by the imaginative theories of twentieth-century scholars. Nevertheless, in my opinion, it is the only satisfactory explanation of v. 8 in our text and of a few more passages in the psalms (see Pss 24; 47; 68). The confirmation of Zion's election in vv. 13-14 explains the entrance of the ark as a sign of that election. So Psalm 132 may be called an introit-song. Since the name Zion, as we saw, stands for Jerusalem, it can be assumed that the psalm was recited at the city gate<sup>(30)</sup>.

As a 'Song of Ascent' (שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת, v. 1), our text belongs to a collection comprising Psalms 120-134. At the festival of Sukkoth these texts were recited, in my view, as procession songs<sup>(31)</sup>. Since in the main their origin is clearly late, Ps 132 must have been brought into use again after the exile; and in all likelihood it was the introit-song once more. Why had the introit-song to be a pre-exilic text? And why was Psalm 132 chosen instead of, for example, Psalm 24? I think the reason is that our text held a promise in matters — the election of Zion, the Davidic reign — that remained to be important to the religious community<sup>(32)</sup>. How exactly the text was understood in post-exilic times is hard to decide. The passage of vv. 6-9, mentioning the ark in v. 8, may have been taken as an echo from David's time; or perhaps there was hope that the ark would come back to Zion some day (cf. 2 Macc 2,4-8). In v. 10 the 'anointed one' may have been understood to be the high priest (cf. eg. Lev 6,15); or the voice of a former king, possibly Solomon, was heard there (cf. 2 Chr 6,41-42). The really important thing was no doubt that the words of the royal psalm reminded God of his promises of old to Israel's faithful<sup>(33)</sup>.

Lomanstraat 32-B  
1075 RC Amsterdam  
Nederlands

TH. BOOIJ

<sup>(30)</sup> In vv. 19-20 of post-exilic Ps 118 the reference is also to the city gate, in all probability (cf. Isa 26,1-2). See D. HAMIDOVIĆ, "'Les portes de justice' et 'la porte de YHWH' dans le Psaume 118,19-20", *Bib* 81 (2000) 542-550. In Ps 132 vv. 6-7 do not mean to suggest that, in the cultic imagination, the ark was taken there directly from Kiriath-Jearim. It is told in 2 Sam 6,10 that David lodged the ark in the house of Obed-Edom the Gittite before taking it to the city of David. This procedure is justified by an aetiological legend (see v. 8b); its historicity, however, is argued by the designation 'Gittite' and the logic of David's choice (cf. 2 Sam 15,18). The description of the procession from Obed-Edom's house has, remarkably, a statement (v. 15) which by its terminology recalls Ps 47,6. S. MOWINCKEL, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (Oxford 1962) I, 171, thinks that ark processions may have started from "a place called the house of Obed Edom".

<sup>(31)</sup> See Isa 30,29; Ps 134,1; Mishnah Sukkah 5,1-4.

<sup>(32)</sup> Cf. Jer 23,5; Ezek 34,23-24; Zech 1,17; 2,16; 3,2; 9,9-10; Neh 1,9.

<sup>(33)</sup> Cf. PsSal 17,4.21; Acts 1,6.

## SUMMARY

Psalm 132, a text from the later pre-exilic time, is about the well-being of Zion and its faithful. This well-being, essentially David's, is grounded on the presence of YHWH in Zion. It is realized when YHWH looks friendly upon the Davidic king. The first part of the psalm (vv. 1-10) asks for this favour on the strength of David's hardships to find for his God a place to dwell. The second part (vv. 11-18) is an answer to the first. The psalm is an introit-song, composed for the festival of Sukkoth. Expressing notions that remained important to the religious community, it was reintroduced after the exile to be used at the same festival.

## Encore une fois les 153 poissons (Jn 21,11)

Depuis longtemps les 153 poissons pêchés par Simon Pierre et ses 6 compagnons en Jn 21 intriguent. De nombreuses hypothèses ont été faites pour expliquer ce nombre étrange<sup>(1)</sup>. Même si aucun consensus ne s'est vraiment dégagé à ce jour, deux choses paraissent certaines à presque tous les commentateurs. D'une part, il s'agit pour l'évangéliste de souligner l'universalité et l'abondance de la pêche. Et, d'autre part, le nombre doit avoir une signification précise pour l'évangéliste, un sens à portée théologique. En effet les nombres qui sont cités par l'évangéliste ont parfois une signification qui dépasse leur valeur numérique et tend vers le symbolique. Le fait même que de nombreux nombres soient donnés avec un 'environ' qui les nuance et rend moins probable un sens second, n'en donne que plus de poids aux nombres qui sont donnés de façon précise<sup>(2)</sup>.

### 1. Pourquoi 153 poissons?

Mais pourquoi 153? Il a été assez vite observé que ce nombre est un nombre triangulaire très apprécié des Grecs. Il consiste en effet en la somme des 17 premiers chiffres ( $1+2+3+4+\dots+17=153$ ). Cela dessine un triangle dont chaque côté comporte 17 points. En outre, les nombres 10 et 7 qui le composent sont deux chiffres qui symbolisent l'universalité. D'où par exemple la tradition des 70 nations qui sont censées former la totalité des nations selon Gn 10 (tel qu'interprété par une partie de la tradition juive)<sup>(3)</sup>.

(1) Pour une synthèse ancienne, on se reportera à H. KRUSE, "Magni Pisces Centum Quinquaginta Tres (Jo 21,11)", *VD* 38 (1960) 129-148, et pour une synthèse récente on pourra lire C. MARUCCI, "Il significato del numero 153 in Gv 21,11", *RivB* 52 (2004) 403-439. Pour une vision représentative de la plupart des grands commentaires, voir R. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John* (AB 29A; New York 1970) 1074-1075.

(2) Il y a les six jarres de Cana, les douze paniers de la multiplication des pains et bien sûr le thème du 3<sup>ème</sup> jour (Jn 2,1). T.L. BRODIE, *The Gospel According to John. A literary and Theological Commentary* (New York – Oxford 1993) 587, souligne, après beaucoup d'autres, les liens qui unissent Jn 6 et Jn 21 en citant B. LINDARS, *The Gospel of John* (London 1972) 630: "Just as the leavings typify the universal feeding of the future, so the catch of fish typifies the universal population that is to be fed". Il relève la place des nombres dans ce parallèle: "The idea that the numbers in 6:1-13 might be connected to these in 21:1-14 finds confirmation in the fact that in these texts, and these texts only, John uses the number 200 (6:7; 21:8). The bringing in of the (153) fish (21:10-11) has essentially the same functions as the gathering up of the fragments (6:12-13). Both are extraneous to the basic account of the meal... Both suggest fullness and both are inaugurated by a command of Jesus: 'Gather' ... 'Bring'. In the case of the fragments nothing is lost; and, as regards the fish, the net is not broken", 588. La connexion entre les deux passages est renforcée par l'allusion au nombre 17. En effet, il y a d'un côté 12 couffins et 5 pains (6,13) et de l'autre le nombre triangulaire de 17 soit 153: "Within John's gospel there is a significant use of the components of 17 (of 10 and 7, and of 12 and 5)".

(3) Cf. les textes bibliques, targumiques et intertestamentaires (1 En 89 et Test. Neph. 8,3-9,5) évoqués à ce propos en A. PAUL, "La Bible grecque d'Aquila et l'idéologie du judaïsme ancien" (éd. H. TEMPORINI – W. HAASE), (*ANRW* II, 20.1; Berlin – New York 1987) 221-225, 233-235.



Cette lecture, qui s'appuie sur la numérologie grecque, a été popularisée par Augustin.

D'un autre côté, plusieurs auteurs ont émis l'hypothèse que ce nombre 153 a un sens en termes de guématria<sup>(4)</sup>. Est-ce vraisemblable? Si l'on admet que le chiffre 666 donné dans Apocalypse (Ap 13,18) a un sens selon la guématria, comme beaucoup le pensent, il ne serait pas impossible qu'un auteur de la même mouvance spirituelle, la communauté johannique d'Asie mineure, ait pu aussi faire un raisonnement analogue. En outre 666 est également un nombre triangulaire ( $1+2+3+4+\dots+36=666$ ). Malgré l'apparente vraisemblance de cette hypothèse, tant de prétendues 'solutions' ont été proposées que l'on peut légitimement être sceptique! Quelle que soit la suggestion retenue, elle devra s'harmoniser avec l'ensemble du récit johannique d'une part et le contexte du passage d'autre part.

## 2. Des propositions décevantes

De nombreuses hypothèses ont été faites pour expliquer ce nombre précis dans Jn 21. Pour ne mentionner que les plus récentes, N.J. McEleney s'est demandé si ce nombre ne renvoyait pas, au moyen d'un système de numérotation complexe, aux trois premières lettres de ἰχθῦς, poisson, et donc à l'acronyme de 'Jésus Christ Dieu': ΙΧΘ<sup>(5)</sup>. Peu après, J.A. Romeo a voulu y lire une guématria reposant sur la valeur de l'expression 'enfants de Dieu' (בני האלהים =  $2+50+10+5+1+30+5+10+40=153$ ), hypothèse que C. Marucci juge in fine<sup>(6)</sup> la plus vraisemblable. En 1986, M. Oberweis pense que ce nombre renvoie par abréviation à Cana de Galilée (כנ =  $100+50+3=153$ ) mais, sans même relever la façon dont elle doit malmener l'écriture hébraïque pour arriver à ses fins, on ne voit pas vraiment l'apport que cette proposition dégage pour l'interprétation de Jn 21<sup>(7)</sup>. De façon plus originale, O.T. Owen a proposé d'y voir une allusion au site de Pisgah (פסגה =  $5+80+60+3+5=153$ ) où Moïse fait ses adieux au peuple (cf. Dt 34,1)<sup>(8)</sup>. Quant à K. Cardwell, il s'appuie sur le fait que le mot 'jour' peut désigner le Christ dans la tradition chrétienne (quoique cet usage soit assez rare reconnaît-il) et représente par guématria en grec 154 (ἡμερὰ =  $8+40+5+100+1=154$ ) pour faire observer que

<sup>(4)</sup> Le terme guématria vient de l'hébreu rabbinique et provient très probablement du grec 'géométrie'. Cette technique d'interprétation consiste à attribuer à chaque mot une valeur numérique basée sur l'addition de la somme de ses lettres. On peut ainsi rapprocher deux termes et donc deux versets. L'exemple biblique classique est Gn 14,14 où le nombre 318 renverrait à la personne d'Eliezer, serviteur d'Abraham (Gn 15,2), dont la valeur numérique est de 318 (אליעזר =  $1+30+10+70+7+200$ ). Sur la guématria, cf. S. SAMBURSKY, "On the origin and significance of the term gematria", *JJS* 29 (1978) 35-38 et J. HØYRUP, "Mathematics, algebra, and geometry", *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (éd. D.N. FREEDMAN) (New York 1992) IV, 602-612.

<sup>(5)</sup> N.J. MCELENEY, "153 Great Fishes (John 21,11) – Gematriacal Atbash", *Bib* 58 (1977) 411-417.

<sup>(6)</sup> J.A. ROMEO, "Gematria and John 21:11 – The Children of God", *JBL* 97 (1978) 263-264. Cf. MARUCCI, "Il significato", 433. Dans la même ligne, KRUSE, "Magni Pisces", 144. Même choix chez G.S. KEENER, *The Gospel of John* (Peabody, MA 2003) II, 1233.

<sup>(7)</sup> M. OBERWEIS, "Die Bedeutung der neutestamentlichen 'Rätselzahlen' 666 (Apk 13,18) und 153 (Joh 21,11)", *ZNW* 77 (1986) 226-241.

<sup>(8)</sup> O.T. OWEN "One hundred and fifty three fishes", *ExpTim* 100 (1988) 52-54.

cela correspond aux 153 poissons du filet plus celui qui est sur le feu<sup>(9)</sup>! Toujours en partant de l'idée que ce nombre doit en quelque manière faire une allusion à la communauté des sauvés, l'Eglise, J. Werlitz part du mot hébreu קדק qui correspond à l'assemblée, l'ἐκκλησία, mais doit pour se faire adopter un système original et peu vraisemblable de numération (קדק = 1(00)+5+3(0)=153!)(<sup>10</sup>). Soutenant à la fois la suggestion de J.A. Romeo et la proposition de J. Emerton que nous verrons plus avant, la contribution spécifique de R. Bauckham consiste à observer que le mot Geddi est le 153<sup>ème</sup> mot dans le chapitre 47 d'Ezekiel(<sup>11</sup>). Plus récemment T. Nicklas s'est intéressé à l'écriture johannique et à ses effets sans vouloir proposer une nouvelle hypothèse sur le nombre lui-même(<sup>12</sup>). Enfin, M. Kiley présente trois hypothèses d'une très haute invraisemblance(<sup>13</sup>). Tout d'abord celle selon laquelle 153 renverrait aux trois lettres grecques désignant le mot vieux (γ, ρ, υ = 3+100+50), Pierre étant le vieux par opposition au jeune Jean! La deuxième s'appuie sur l'importance du nombre 5 qui est au milieu de 153! La troisième relève que 17 est la somme de 8 et de 9 et 153 la multiplication de 9 par 17 et en déduit une allusion au "croissez et multipliez" de Gn 1,28... J'avoue que la pertinence de ces hypothèses par rapport au contexte de Jean m'échappe. L'impasse serait-elle définitive?

### 3. L'hypothèse du lien à Ez 47

L'interprétation doit repartir du contexte. A quoi peuvent correspondre les deux nombres 17 et 153? Commençons par 17. Nous sommes au bord de la mer et il s'agit de poissons. On remarque que le pluriel construit de 'poissons', דגים, a la valeur numérique de 17 (4+3+10) mais il y a mieux. Le passage vétértestamentaire auquel cette scène renvoie le mieux est, de l'avis quasi unanime des commentaires, celui de la vision d'Ezékiel 47, où le prophète voit l'eau sortant du côté droit du Temple et assainissant et irriguant la terre: "Et alors tous les êtres vivants qui fourmillent vivront partout où pénétrera le torrent. Ainsi le poisson [17] sera très abondant, car cette eau arrivera là et les eaux de la mer seront assainies: il y aura de la vie partout où pénétrera le

(9) K. CARDWELL, "The Fish on the Fire: Jn 21:9", *ExpTim* 102 (1990) 12-14.

(10) J. WERLITZ, "Warum gerade 153 Fische? Überlegungen zu Joh 21,11", *Johannes aenigmaticus. Studien zum Johannesevangelium für Herbert Leroy* (éd. S. SCHREIBER – A. STIMPFLE) (BU 29; Regensburg 2000) 121-137.

(11) R. BAUCKHAM, "The 153 fish and the unity of the fourth gospel", *Neot* 36 (2002) 77-88. Il écrit: "Thus the 153 fish of John 21:11 constitute a reference to Eglaim in Ezek 47:10 and at the same time are to be understood as signifying 'the children of God', since this phrase has the same numerical value (153) as the word Eglaim", 83, et il ajoute, 84, que 'signe' revient 17 fois dans l'Evangile et que les termes 'croire' (98), 'Christ' (19) et 'vie' (36) reviennent au total 153 fois! Il fait feu de tout bois.

(12) T. NICKLAS, "'153 große Fische' (Joh 21,11) Erzählerische Ökonomie und 'johanneischer Überstieg'", *Bib* 84 (2003) 366-387. Jean crée un effet qui pousse le lecteur à la recherche: "Bei der Erwähnung der '153 großen Fische' handelt es sich somit um einen offensichtlichen Verstoß gegen die 'Konvention erzählerischer Ökonomie'... Gerade dieses Zusammentreffen und die Tatsache, dass die hier begegnende nicht die erste sinnbildlich zu interpretierende Zahl im Johannesevangelium wäre, zwingt den Leser geradezu zum Überstieg in eine symbolische Deutung der '153 Fische'", 377.

(13) M. KILEY, "Three more fish stories: John 21:11", *JBL* 127 (2008) 529-531.

torrent. Alors des pêcheurs se tiendront sur la rive; et depuis Ein-Geddi [17] jusqu'à Ein-Eglaïm [153], ce sera un séchoir à filets. Les espèces de poissons seront aussi nombreuses que celles de la grande mer" (Ez 47,9-10)<sup>(14)</sup>. Le premier terme traduit ici par 'poisson' est דגה, le féminin du nom דג, employé aussi dans l'histoire de Jonas en Jn 2,2. Sa valeur numérique est de 17 (5+4+3+5=17). Ce terme est rare et ne se trouve, avec l'article, qu'en Jon 2,2, Nb 11,5 et Ez 47,9. Il est employé, sans article, pour parler du poisson en Dt 4,18. Le chiffre 17 renverrait donc bien à une abondance messianique de poissons symbolisant toute l'humanité. Or les poissons sont bien au cœur de la scène de Jn 21.

Mais où trouvons-nous 153? On remarque alors que la valeur numérique de Eglāim, est bien de 153 (70+3+30+10+40=153). Où se trouve cette Ein Eglāim? On ne sait pas vraiment. Une Eglāim se trouve bien en Moab où elle est mentionnée en Is 15,8. Mais l'on sait qu'Ein Geddi se trouve au bord de la Mer Morte, du côté judéen. Eglāim renvoie donc aux nations, puisqu'elle se situe vers la rive moabite, païenne, de la Mer Morte. Certes la localité n'est pas au bord du lac de Galilée. Cependant une tradition talmudique faisait parvenir l'eau sortant du Temple non point dans la Mer Morte mais bien dans le lac de Tibériade<sup>(15)</sup>. En outre, comment mieux dire le contraste entre la mort dont le Christ sauve et la source d'eau vive? Certes le Christ a œuvré au bord du lac de Galilée mais sa tâche a bien consisté à permettre aux poissons, à tous les poissons, d'entrer dans la vie. Et des pêcheurs se tiendront sur toutes les rives pour pêcher une grande abondance de poissons. Geddi (גדי) a la même valeur numérique 17 que le terme 'poisson' utilisé au verset précédent. En outre Geddi (גדי) est l'anagramme de 'poissons' au pluriel construit (גדי). L'idée serait donc que le Messie Jésus rassemble tous les poissons, ceux de la rive d'Israël, ceux d'Ein Geddi, jusqu'à ceux des nations, ceux d'Ein Eglāim.

<sup>(14)</sup> TOB. Le premier à avoir repéré les liens entre Ein Geddi (17) et Ein Eglāim (153) est, à ma connaissance, J.A. EMERTON: J.A. EMERTON, "The Hundred and Fifty-Three Fishes in John 21", *JTS* 9 (1958) 86-89. Il a été discuté par P.R. ACKROYD, "The 153 Fishes in John XXI.11 — A Further Note", *JTS* 10 (1959) 94, qui a proposé une guématria basée sur le grec de certains manuscrits. Emerton répondit à Ackroyd en 1960: J.A. EMERTON, "Some New Testament Notes IV. Gematria in John 21,11", *JTS* 11 (1960) 335-336. Dans le même sens, P. TRUDINGER, "The 153 fishes: a response and a further suggestion", *ExpTim* 102 (1990) 11-12.

<sup>(15)</sup> B. GRIGSBY, "Gematria and John 21.11 - Another Look at Ezekiel 47:10", *ExpTim* 95 (1983/84) 177-178, souligne la logique du parallèle avec Ez dans le cadre théologique de Jn et cite une tradition rabbinique liant ce passage d'Ezéchiel au lac de Tibériade: "According to the rhetorical exchange in t.Sukk. 3:9 concerning the term 'Arabah' (Ez 47<sup>8</sup>), the tumbling eschatological streams of Ezekiel's vision flow north and enter the Sea of Tiberias rather than flow east and enter the Dead Sea as the MT implies. Perhaps it is more than a coincidence of topographical idiosyncrasy that the Sea of Galilee is referred to as the Sea of Tiberias only twice in the NT: Jn 6<sup>1</sup> and here 21<sup>1</sup>... If this is the case, the proposal of thematic connexions between Jn 21 (a miraculous draught of fish in previously 'dead' water, pursuant to the command of the resurrected Christ) and Ez 47 (a thriving fishing industry along the banks of a previously 'dead' sea, pursuant to the influx of oxygenated, life-giving water from the new temple) becomes even more relevant", 178. C'est pourquoi G.J. BROOKE, "4Q252 and the 153 Fish of John 21:11", *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum* (éd. B. KOLLMANN et al.) (BZNW 97; Berlin - New York 1999) 253-265, peut écrire, 260: "Even the fact that the places in Ezek 47:10 are both to be found at the Dead Sea rather than the Sea of Galilee is also not insurmountable in light of the tradition in t. Sukk. 3:9 in which the waters referred to in Ezek 47:8 flow into the Sea of Tiberias".

#### 4. Le sens théologique du renvoi à Ezékiel

Il convient de relever en outre que le renvoi à ce passage d'Ezékiel a du sens dans l'ensemble de l'Evangile de Jean, qui fait référence plusieurs fois au Christ source de vie (cf. Jn 7,37-39 et 19,34) en lien avec la fête de Sukkot. Une des hypothèses mentionnées dans l'Antiquité sur le chiffre 153 est qu'il faisait référence pour les Grecs à toutes les espèces de poissons. Cette piste, avancée notamment par Jérôme, a été contestée car aucun texte d'un savant grec ne mentionne ce nombre (pas même celui allégué par Jérôme lui-même!) mais le texte d'Ezékiel fait bien référence au fait que "les espèces de poissons seront aussi nombreuses que celles de la grande mer". On aurait ici un texte biblique allant dans le sens de l'universalité en s'appuyant sur toutes les espèces de poissons. Ainsi l'auteur de Jn 21 a établi un lien discret entre le passage scripturaire d'Ezékiel évoquant l'eau vive irriguant tout ce qui est mort depuis la terre d'Israël (Ein Geddi) jusqu'à la terre païenne de Moab (Ein Eglaim) et la pêche des Apôtres du Christ. Par ailleurs, l'allusion au fait que la pêche se fait par le côté droit (21,6: βάλετε εἰς τὸ δεξιόν) de la barque (élément absent de la pêche miraculeuse en Lc 5) fait écho au côté droit du Temple par où s'écoule l'eau de la vie en Ez 47,1.2 (LXX: τὸ ὕδωρ κατέβαινε ἀπὸ τοῦ κλίτους τοῦ δεξιοῦ). On peut ajouter que le texte de la LXX, probablement celui qui est à la base immédiate de Jean, est proche du TM et contient tous les éléments essentiels: tous les êtres vivants (πάντα ψυχὴ τῶν ζώων), beaucoup de poissons (ἰχθὺς πολλὸς σφόδρα), la présence de pêcheurs et de séchoirs à filets (ἀλεῖς ... ψυγμὸς σαγηνῶν), et de poissons qui seront comme ceux de la grande mer (οἱ ἰχθύες αὐτῆς ὡς οἱ ἰχθύες τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς μεγάλης πληθὺς πολλὸς σφόδρα).

La prophétie d'Ez 47 n'a ainsi pas été seulement interprétée sur fond christologique (Jn 7,37) et pneumatologique (Jn 19,34) mais également en termes ecclésiologiques. A. Pitta l'exprime avec justesse: "Il prodigio atteso da Ez 47 con la pasqua del Cristo, non si realizza soltanto in termini cristologici (cf. Gv 2,21; 7,37) e pneumatologici (cf. 4,23; 7,39; 19,34) ma anche ecclesiologici. Ci sembra pertanto che la corrispondenza gematria tra 153 ed Eglayim illumini in modo significativo l'intera pericope di Gv 21,1-14"<sup>(16)</sup>. Ce n'est pas seulement Jn 21 que la référence à Ezékiel 47 éclaire mais l'ensemble de ses échos dans l'évangile de Jean.

#### 5. La dimension pétrinienne de la péricope

Un article de G. Brooke a apporté un élément nouveau. Tout en s'inscrivant à la suite de J. Emerton, il a voulu apporter un élément supplémentaire à propos du nombre 153. Il s'appuie pour cela sur un texte de Qumran, 4Q252, dans lequel les nombres 17 et 153 sont mis en lien avec Noé<sup>(17)</sup>. Ce document refait toute la chronologie du déluge et aboutit à la

<sup>(16)</sup> A. PITTA, "Ichthys ed opsarion in Gv 21,1-14; semplice variazione lessicale o differenza con valore simbolico?", *Bib* 71 (1990) 348-363, 361.

<sup>(17)</sup> Cf. BROOKE, "4Q252", 265: "The implicit occurrence together of 4Q252 of 153 and 17 in association with Sukkoth supports reading John 21,1-14 in light of Ez 47. In particular such a juxtaposition lends yet further support to the suggestion of J. A. Emerton that the place names of Ezek 47:10 can explain the number 153 by gematria".

conclusion que c'est le 153<sup>ème</sup> jour, le 17<sup>ème</sup> jour du 7<sup>ème</sup> mois, que l'arche vient se poser sur le sommet de la montagne. Il observe donc que nous retrouvons les mêmes nombres clefs que dans le texte de Jean<sup>(18)</sup> et dans celui d'Ezékiel. Il rappelle que la typologie de Noé comme symbole du salut et du baptême était connu du christianisme primitif comme le montre 1 P 3,20-21. Quel lien avec Jean 21? Il remarque que, selon le calendrier de Qumran mis en œuvre par ce document, c'est lors de la fête de Sukkot que l'arche se pose<sup>(19)</sup>. Or la grande fête qui se trouve à l'arrière-plan de Jn 7-10 et de Jn 19,34 est la fête de Sukkot<sup>(20)</sup>.

Ainsi, si nous suivons l'étude de Brooke, il y a un lien non seulement avec Ez 47 mais aussi avec le récit de l'arche de Noé tel qu'il était lu à l'époque. La nature pétrinienne du passage en est renforcée. C'est le rassemblement des disciples sous la houlette de Pierre qui est visé: "The use of Noah and the flood to understand John 21:1-14 underlines the peculiarly petrine character of John 21"<sup>(21)</sup>. Or cette péripécie a clairement pour objectif de souligner le lien à Pierre dans la communauté johannique et son rôle dans l'Eglise. De même que la tunique de Jésus n'avait pas été divisée (Jn 19,24), le filet ne s'est pas divisé (21,11b), seuls emplois du verbe σχίζειν dans l'évangile de Jean. "Gerade für einen Modellleser des gesamten Kanons, dem z.B. das Bild von 'Menschenfischern' (Mk 1,17 par) bekannt ist, legt sich ja auch in der für den Erzählfluss vordergründig überflüssig wirkenden Bemerkung, dass das Netz nicht 'zerriss', eine symbolische Deutung auf die 'Kirche' nahe. Dass diese wiederum auf die Interpretation der '153 Fische' zurückwirkt, ist offensichtlich" remarque à juste titre T. Nicklas<sup>(22)</sup>. Le nombre de poissons que pêchent des pêcheurs d'hommes ne peut être anodin.

Les parallèles maintes fois relevés entre, d'une part, le récit de la pêche miraculeuse en Lc 5 avec la parole adressée à Simon-Pierre ("Désormais ce sont des hommes que tu prendras"; 5,10) et sa "multitude de poissons" (Lc 5,6), et la dimension ecclésiologique de Jn 21 d'autre part, vont dans ce sens également. Même si les autres disciples ont tiré le filet depuis la barque, c'est le seul Pierre qui tire le filet à terre (Jn 21,11b). De même l'emploi du même mot rare, ἀνθρωπιάν, pour le feu de braises (Jn 21,9), renvoie au reniement (Jn 18,18) et confirme le renouvellement de la mission donnée à Pierre qui va suivre immédiatement. Tout comme Lc 22,31-32, Jean a choisi de relier étroitement rappel de la chute de Pierre et confirmation de sa

<sup>(18)</sup> Il fait remarquer que le nombre 7 se trouve implicitement présent en Jn 21 puisqu'il y a 7 disciples.

<sup>(19)</sup> Cf. BROOKE, "4Q252", 258.

<sup>(20)</sup> Cf. BROOKE, "4Q252", 258: "In the Fourth Gospel, Sukkoth forms the background of the narrative of John 7:1-8:59 and beyond". Le travail de L. DEVILLERS, *La fête de l'envoyé, la section johannique de la fête des tentes (Jean 7,1-10,21) et la christologie* (Paris 2002), met bien en valeur l'importance de la liturgie de la fête des Tentes pour la symbolique de l'Evangile de Jean. Après avoir noté que "le lien entre Jn 7,38 et Jn 19,34 semble indiquer une allusion au Temple d'Ezékiel", il juge in fine, 325, que la citation de Jn 7,38 vise davantage Za 14,8: "Le texte de Zacharie me paraît préférable. C'est dans ce même chapitre que l'on trouve une triple allusion à la fête des tentes". De fait, Zacharie 14 et Ezékiel 47 ont de nombreuses affinités, notamment l'écho de Sukkot.

<sup>(21)</sup> Cf. BROOKE, "4Q252", 263.

<sup>(22)</sup> Cf. NICKLAS, "'153 große Fische'", 377.

mission. Le rôle apostolique spécifique de Pierre vis-à-vis de ses frères n'est pas d'abord évoqué lors du ministère galiléen mais lors du récit de la Passion (Lc) ou de la Résurrection (Jn). C'est à partir de l'épreuve, surmontée en raison de la prière du Christ, que l'appel peut être entendu de nouveau. L'ecclésiologie de Jn 21 couvre donc l'ensemble de la mission apostolique: les Apôtres comme pécheurs d'hommes, la communauté unie comme rassemblement des Juifs et des nations, le rôle spécifique dévolu à Pierre (sans exclure les appels particuliers), l'enracinement permanent dans la Parole du Christ et dans le pain partagé (allusion limpide à l'eucharistie en Jn 21,13) pour que la mission porte du fruit. La dimension du salut eschatologique largement ouvert envisagée par Ezékiel 47 trouve bien son accomplissement en Jn 21.

### 6. Une convergence d'indices

Résumons les raisons qui rendent plausible le fait que l'Evangéliste Jean ait choisi les nombres 17 et 153 en raison du texte d'Ez 47,9-10:

- a. Les nombres 17 et 153 sont présents par guématria en Ez 47,9-10 pour signifier les rives juive et païenne de la Mer Morte. Ils pointent vers l'universalité de la nouvelle communauté.
- b. Jean a montré l'importance des 'eaux vives' tout au long de son Evangile (cf. Jn 4) et la tradition johannique poursuivra ce thème qui sera repris en Ap 21,6. Or l'eau vive est bien présente dans le texte d'Ezékiel. L'eau vive sort du côté droit du Temple comme l'eau sortira du côté de Jésus. Il est l'accomplissement de la prophétie d'Ez 47,1-12 et de Za 14,6-8.
- c. Un autre élément du texte de Jn 21 pourrait s'expliquer par la référence au texte d'Ezékiel: C'est la précision selon laquelle les poissons sont "gros". En effet "les espèces de poissons seront aussi nombreuses que celles de la grande mer" avait dit Ezékiel, or la mer contient bien de gros poissons que l'on ne trouve pas dans le lac de Tibériade.
- d. La tradition johannique connaît la guématria comme le montre l'emploi de 666, nombre triangulaire analogue à 153, en Ap 13,18. Ces nombres triangulaires étaient appréciés des mathématiciens grecs<sup>(23)</sup>.
- e. Le nombre 17 correspond non seulement au nom de lieu d'Eïn Geddi mais renvoie aussi en Ez 47,9 à l'usage rare du terme 'poisson' au féminin (דגה) en hébreu pour dire "les poissons". Le nombre 17 évoque en outre le pluriel construit de poissons: דגים, anagramme de Geddi. Il crée ainsi un lien simple entre les deux textes, ce qui permet dans un second temps de rechercher le nombre 153<sup>(24)</sup>. Cet élément n'avait pas été remarqué par Emerton, or il renforce nettement la simplicité du rapprochement avec Ez 47,9-10.

<sup>(23)</sup> BROWN, *John*, 1074, relève que les "triangular numbers were of interest both to Greek mathematicians and to biblical authors". Luc aussi connaît ces nombres triangulaires comme 276 en Ac 27,37 (triangulaire de 23).

<sup>(24)</sup> J'ai moi-même procédé ainsi parvenant au 153 sans avoir alors connaissance de l'article de J. A. Emerton.

- f. L'existence de deux termes pour dire 'poisson' dans le texte de Jn 21 (le terme habituel présent dans la LXX, ἰχθύς, et le terme rare, ὀψάριον, qui renvoie davantage au poisson comme nourriture et avait été utilisé en Jn 6,9) attire l'attention du lecteur sur ce terme et le pousse à chercher du côté des passages bibliques contenant ce terme<sup>(25)</sup>.
- g. Cette interprétation cadre avec le sens obvie de la scène : elle insiste sur l'universalité de la communauté des disciples et sur le fait que les Apôtres du Christ rassemblent dans un même 'filet' les Juifs et les païens. Malgré le grand nombre, le filet ne se rompt pas, signe d'unité.
- h. Ce nombre symbolise de lui-même le double appel de l'Evangile adressé aux juifs et aux païens. C'est en quelque sorte un double code bi-culturel, qui fait ainsi également écho à la dimension messianique et universaliste de la fête de Sukkot au 1<sup>er</sup> siècle.

Dans son commentaire, R. Brown reconnaissait la force de cette hypothèse mais la trouvait tout de même in fine, avec beaucoup d'autres, un peu trop sophistiquée<sup>(26)</sup>. Cependant, si l'on ajoute aux deux termes de lieux, l'allusion à la guématria de 'poisson', l'opération paraît nettement plus aisée<sup>(27)</sup>, d'autant plus que, sans aucune guématria, les commentateurs en arrivent d'eux-mêmes spontanément à ce passage d'Ezékïel comme étant le parallèle vétérotestamentaire le plus proche de Jn 21. Par rapport à l'étude d'Emerton, d'une part nous renforçons l'hypothèse de la guématria en nous appuyant sur le texte même d'Ez 47, et d'autre part, nous ajoutons d'autres éléments complémentaires, relevés depuis par d'autres travaux, qui en augmentent la vraisemblance: le lien entre Jn 6 et Jn 21 souligné par T. Brodie, la place de Ez 47 dans l'ensemble de Jean et la distinction des deux termes pour 'poisson' mises en valeur par A. Pitta, le parallèle avec la tradition talmudique mentionnant le lac de Tibériade indiqué par B. Grigsby et enfin le parallèle de type ecclésiologique avec Qumran relevé par G. Brooke.

\*  
\* \*

Le nombre 153 a donc une double vertu: d'une part, il exprime une complétude et une beauté géométrique qui était admirable pour les Grecs et, d'autre part, il renvoie aux Ecritures d'une façon que des Juifs versés dans les Ecritures pouvaient apprécier. C'est un nombre en quelque sorte

<sup>(25)</sup> Cet élément est relevé par PITTA, "Ichthys", 356: "Anche in Lc abbiamo la simbologia della pesca che diventa modello della missione apostolica". Il ajoute: "La variante lessicale di *opsarion* ed *ichthys*... è determinata più da motivazioni ecclesiologiche che di narrazioni composita", 363.

<sup>(26)</sup> Cf. BROWN, *John*, 1075: "Of more interest is the gematria proposed by Emerton 1958, based on the passage in Ezek xlvi. This passage was known in Johannine circles, for it forms the background for Rev xxii 1-2 (the river of life flowing from the throne of the Lamb) and perhaps for John vii 37 (the river of living water flowing from within Jesus)".

<sup>(27)</sup> Cf. BROOKE, "4Q252", 265: "Together with the obvious of gematria elsewhere in the broader Johannine tradition, the number of fish in John 21:11 seems altogether less esoteric than has sometimes been thought. It is the number that represents the baptized, those brought safely through water, who are the fulfillment of the expectations of Ezekiel 47".

‘œcuménique’, qui traduit l’un des messages essentiels de l’Evangile: le Christ est venu pour les Juifs et pour les Grecs et il rassemble dans ses filets, grâce à ses Apôtres unis à Pierre, tous les poissons du monde.

128 rue Blomet  
F-75015 - Paris

Marc RASTOIN

#### SUMMARY

The number of fishes in Joh 21,11 has been a crux for the interpreters of the Fourth Gospel. If the theological meaning of the scene seemed to be clear enough — an allusion to the universality of salvation brought by Christ — the why of the number 153 tried the imagination of scholars since Augustine. This note intends to add several arguments to the proposition made by J. Emerton in 1958 that this number refers to Ez 47,1-12. The link between both passages becomes much easier to make and the theological coherence of this allusion within Johannine global theological framework appears more clearly.



## Τῶν λαληθησομένων in Hebrews 3,5

The words τῶν λαληθησομένων in Heb 3,5 have not received the attention they merit. They occur in a verse which has echoes of Num 12,7[LXX], and this tends to direct the attention to their Old Testament antecedents<sup>(1)</sup>. In addition, the word λαλέω seems to resume the theme of God's "speaking" at the beginning of the epistle, at Heb 1,1<sup>(2)</sup>. Both of these indications merit further investigation. But they need to be considered in the context of still a third line of reasoning which points to Heb 9,19-20, where λαλέω is used in connection with Moses' inauguration of the Sinai covenant. But this third line of reasoning must be carried out in the structured context of Heb 1,1-3,6 if it is to be suasive.

The present study will examine first the approaches based on the relevance of Num 12,7[LXX] and the thematic use of λαλέω, and will then turn to the relevance of Heb 9,19-20 before studying the results of these investigations in the structured context of the first part of the epistle.

### 1. *The Relevance of Numbers 12,7[LXX]*

The presence of the words Μωϋσῆς, θεράπων, οἶκος and πιστός in the text of Num 12,7[LXX] has led to the inference that the author of Hebrews had this verse in mind when he wrote 3,5<sup>(3)</sup>. But, as not infrequently in Hebrews, the author of Hebrews puts the words to different use. Moses is indeed "faithful", but for the author of Hebrews he is assigned a role subordinate to the "son", i.e., Jesus. In this subordinate role he gives a witness to that which "will be spoken" instead of being the one to whom God "speaks"<sup>(4)</sup>.

This subordination of Moses to Jesus is the true relevance of Num 12,7 with regard to the explanation of τῶν λαληθησομένων in Heb 3,5. For just as the parallelism of Jesus with Moses dominates Heb 3,1-6, so, by implication, it dominates the allusion contained in τῶν λαληθησομένων. If Moses is giving witness in 3,6 there is only one person, judging from the context of 3,1-6, he could be giving witness to — Jesus. Hence the meaning of τῶν λαληθησομένων is to be found in some relation invoking Moses and Jesus.

### 2. *The Relevance of λαλέω*

The fact that the word λαλέω occurs so prominently at the very beginning of the epistle, with regard to God in 1,1 and with regard to the son in 1,2,

(1) Cf.: H.W. ATTRIDGE, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, PA 1989) 111; W.L. LANE, *Hebrews 1-8* (WBC 47A; Dallas, TX 1991) 78. For a lengthy commentary on the possibilities as regards the Old Testament cf. P. ELLINGWORTH, *The Epistle to the Hebrews. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGCT; Grand Rapids, MI – Carlisle, England 1993) 207-208.

(2) Cf. ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 111; LANE, *Hebrews*.

(3) Cf. F. SCHRÖGER, *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes als Schriftausleger* (BU 4; Regensburg 1969) 95-101.

(4) Cf. ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 111.

would seem to indicate that for the author of the epistle the word has a particular significance. But if there is a particular significance it has not figured prominently in contemporary commentaries on the epistle as such a thematic significance presumably should<sup>(5)</sup>.

The word λαλέω occurs sixteen times in Hebrews: 1,1 — of God; 1,2 — of God with reference to the son; 2,2 — passive, with “through angels”; 2,3 — passive with “through the son”; 2,5 — of the author of the epistle; 3,5 — passive with no explicit indication of agent; 4,8 — of David; 5,5 — of God; 6,9 — of the author of the epistle; 7,14 — of “Moses”, i.e., the Mosaic Law; 9,19 — of Moses; 11,4 — of the blood of Abel; 11,18 — of God; 12,24 — of the blood of Jesus; 12,25 — of Jesus; 13,7 — of the leaders of the Christians.

The first two occurrences of λαλέω are found in the key verses 1,1 and 1,2. In 1,1 God is said to have “spoken” “in the prophets”<sup>(6)</sup>. The unstated supposition underlying this verse is that God’s “speaking” (λαλέω) in recognized sources is uniquely and definitively authoritative and should be respected accordingly. To belabor the point would have been to insult the author’s addressees. In 1,2 this speaking is brought into relation with the son. The son’s speaking is said to be God’s speaking. The reason for this identification is to invest the speaking of the son with the authority of God<sup>(7)</sup>. This, too, needs no further explanation, given the Christian faith of the addressees: Heb 1,2 as regards the authoritative nature of the son’s speaking is a reminder for the epistle’s addressees, not a disclosure<sup>(8)</sup>. Thus the word λαλέω has a connotation of divine authority in its first two occurrences in the epistle, occurrences which indicate that λαλέω has a thematic role in what follows<sup>(9)</sup>.

Most of the other fourteen occurrences of λαλέω can be divided without hesitation into one or other of the two principal categories of God’s “speaking in the prophets” (1,1) and “speaking in a son” (1,2)<sup>(10)</sup>. This facility in

<sup>(5)</sup> Attridge, for example, refers to the use of the word as initiating the “theme” of God’s “speech” (ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 111). But he does not explore the implications of this assessment. The present writer knows of no detailed attempt to understand how the author of Hebrews uses the word λαλέω throughout his work.

<sup>(6)</sup> “God’s address of old came ‘through’ (ἐν) the prophets, agents with whom Hebrews is not, in fact, much concerned. They are probably understood, in a broad sense, to encompass all those, from the patriarchs through Moses, Joshua, David and the classical prophets, through whom God speaks” (ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 38-39).

<sup>(7)</sup> ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 37-38.

<sup>(8)</sup> It should be noted that the “speaking” in a son is mentioned as a matter of fact in which the faith assent of the addressees is presumed. The author of the epistle in what follows will attempt to help the addressees understand the implications of their faith with regard to the challenge which they are facing and to remind them of their obligations and opportunities in its regard. He is not trying to solicit faith — he presumes it. He is concerned that the addressees not lose their faith or become weak in it.

<sup>(9)</sup> In terms of New Testament lexicography this use of λαλέω would seem to fit in category 2ε of Bauer: “Das Reden kann v. näher bestimmter Art sein” (W. BAUER, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*, K. ALAND – B. ALAND [eds.] [Berlin – New York 1988] col. 941). It is worth noting how often in the Patristic period the subject of the verb λαλέω is one of the divine persons or one of the Old Testament prophets. Cf. G.W.A. LAMPE (ed.), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1961) 790-791.

<sup>(10)</sup> It should be noted that Hebrews seems to carry on the usage of Septuagint Greek of continuing on with the content of something introduced by λαλέω by using a form of

categorization tends to support the view that there is indeed a thematic role which is being played by the word.

God is presented as “speaking in the prophets” in six places: in 2,2 (the speaking of the Law through angels); in 4,8 (the speaking of David in Ps 95); in 7,14 (the speaking of Moses as regards the tribe of Judah; in 11,4 (the speaking of Abel’s blood as a witness to faith); and in 11,18 (the speaking of God in scripture as regards Isaac as the vehicle of the fulfillment of God’s promise of offspring to Abraham).

Four occurrences may be listed immediately under God “speaking in a son”: in 2,3 (an explicit attribution to “the Lord” of “speaking”) and in 12,24 and 12,25 (in connection with the “speaking” of Christ’s blood). In 5,5 God is pictured as “speaking” at the moment of the son’s resurrection through the use of citations from Ps 2,7 and Ps 110,4. Here the Old Testament words have a New Testament meaning. God is introduced as speaking not explicitly “in” a son but “with regard to” (πρός) a son. The wording of the texts themselves indicates that God is speaking “to” a son, and thus, by implication, “in” what is happening to the son.

Four occurrences remain to be accounted for. In 2,5 and 6,9 the author of the epistle appropriates the use of λαλέω in using it with reference to his own “speaking”. In 2,5 he relies on the authority of a citation from Ps 8 which he introduces by means of the word διαμαρτύρεσθαι, a word which has a connotation of divine authority independently of the one citing it<sup>(11)</sup>. In 6,9 he uses the present tense to indicate that he is continuing the discourse which he had pronounced in 5,11–6,8<sup>(12)</sup>. Now, in 6,9–28, he assumes a positive tone, by giving his encouraging opinion about a contingent fact – that the addressees will choose what is better for themselves. But he uses the authoritative verb λαλέω to make this statement about a contingent fact, something which he realizes is beyond his competence as an authoritative spokesman whose duty is to present the sureties of faith. Hence the apologetic tone conveyed by εἰ καὶ οὕτως. He can present an explanation of the ὁμολογία on the basis of his personal authority because that is what he is authorized to do, but his personal conviction about the future conduct of the addressees does not entitle him, strictly speaking, to use a statement based on such authority. It is all part of his use of literary convention in order to encourage the addressees<sup>(13)</sup>.

But where does the author of Hebrews get the authority which he seems to have on this reading of his appropriating λαλέω to himself? An answer seems to be given by the third use of λαλέω as yet unaccounted for: 13,7. There λαλέω is used of the “leaders” of the addressees who “spoke” to them the “word of God” (τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ). This expression is usually taken as

λέγω (cf. BAUER, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, §3 [col. 942]). Thus the string of the various forms of λέγω in Heb 1,5.6.13 can probably best be interpreted as continuing a “speaking” “in a son”. Cf. Heb 5,5 where the word λαλέω is used with Ps 2,7 with regard to the son, and the following psalm citation is introduced by λέγει.

<sup>(11)</sup> H.-F. WEIB, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (KKNT 13; Göttingen 1991) 193–194.

<sup>(12)</sup> ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 329.

<sup>(13)</sup> Cf. ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 174–175 for information about the conventions involved but apart from the present writer’s interpretation involving λαλέω.

referring to preaching<sup>(14)</sup>. The way the text is formulated indicates that the speaking of the leaders was validated in some way as being part of a tradition<sup>(15)</sup>. In view of the present writer's interpretation of the thirteenth chapter of Hebrews, this "speaking" should be understood in a liturgical sense in context of the Christian *tôdâ*<sup>(16)</sup>. There is question in Heb 13,7 of authorized leaders, as the text makes clear. And they "speak" the word of God authoritatively. The "word of God" is here to be understood as Jesus himself, for otherwise the following verse 13,8 is an inexplicable insertion<sup>(17)</sup>. Thus it would seem that the authoritative "speaking" of God has been passed on to the leaders of the community and in some sense the author of the epistle. Just why this extension of authority took place seems hinted at in 2,3-4 where "the beginning of being spoken of the salvation by the Lord" was officially validated in some way (cf. the use of *βεβαιόω* and witnessed to by God (*συνεπιμαρτυρέομαι*))<sup>(18)</sup>. The author of the epistle and the leaders who speak the word of God to the faithful are those commissioned to validate the beginning of the speaking of salvation through the Lord<sup>(19)</sup>. And they can do this because they have the authority to do so.

Thus Heb 2,5 and Heb 6,9 as well as Heb 13,7 can be put in the category of God's "speaking in a son". There remains one text for examination: Heb 3,5.

### 3. *λαλέω* in Hebrews 3,5 in the Light of Heb 9,19-20

A preliminary assessment of Heb 3,5 above in its context has led to the result that the agent of "the things which will be spoken" (*τῶν λαληθησομένων*) probably is Jesus Christ, for he is the one with whom Moses is being compared in the passage 3,1-6. An assessment of the word *λαλέω* in the entire epistle has led to the conclusion that it connotes the authority of God in speaking, and that this authority was shown in the old dispensation in God's speaking "in the prophets" and in the new dispensation in his speaking

<sup>(14)</sup> W.L. LANE, *Hebrews 9-13* (WBC 47B; Dallas, TX 1991) 526-527.

<sup>(15)</sup> "The formulation indicates that the leaders were a link in the chain of tradition that accounted for the reliable transmission of the message of salvation to the audience" (LANE, *Hebrews 1-8*, 527).

<sup>(16)</sup> The detailed presentation of the Christian *tôdâ*, in Chapter 13 of Hebrews, must be kept in mind in all that follows in this note. The addressees presumably had not heard/read Chapter 13 when they heard/read Heb 3,5, but they certainly were aware of the tradition which the author of Hebrews presumed in writing Heb 13: it is inconceivable that they were unaware of the liturgical tradition of the faith which they professed. Cf. J. SWETNAM, "A Liturgical Approach to Hebrews 13", *Letter and Spirit* 3 (2006) 159-173 and, in a shorter but clearer version, J. SWETNAM, "A Liturgical Approach to Hebrews 13", *The Incarnate Word* 1 (2006) 3-17.

<sup>(17)</sup> "This apparently isolated statement [sc., 13,8] has no syntactic connection with what precedes or follows; its content also seems general and unrelated to the surrounding exhortation" (ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 704).

<sup>(18)</sup> Cf. ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 65-67, for discussion of the legal language in 2,1-4.

<sup>(19)</sup> ELLINGWORTH (*Hebrews*, 139) states with regard to Heb 2,3 that "it is significant that the author claims no distinct authority for himself". Perhaps this failure to claim authority for himself was caused by his not needing to make such a claim. In Heb 13,17 he presumes the authority to exhort the addressees to behave as regards their leaders who, he asserts (13,7) have authority themselves. This would seem to imply that the author of the epistle had some sort of authority himself. Cf. n. 16 above.

“in a son”. Putting these two preliminary assessments together, the result is that in 3,5 God is “speaking in a prophet” (Moses) to give witness to a “speaking in a son” (Christ). A common reason for minimizing this conclusion is that the author of Hebrews does not seem to develop any theme touching on the Eucharist<sup>(20)</sup>.

The text which Hebrews seems to have in mind in Heb 3,5 is Heb 9,20, where Moses and the word λαλέω are found in the same context, the only such instance in Hebrews:

When every command according to the law had been spoken (λαληθείσης) by Moses to the entirety of the people, and after he had taken the blood of calves and goats with water and scarlet wool and hyssop he sprinkled the book itself and all the people, saying, “This (τοῦτο) is the blood of the covenant which God ordered for you” (9,19-20).

What is intriguing about the words which Moses “speaks”<sup>(21)</sup> in 9,20 is the fact that the citation from Ex 24,8 which they purport to reproduce have been altered slightly<sup>(22)</sup>. Some commentators say that the alteration has been done for reasons which have to do only with the author’s arguments in the epistle. But most authors concur that the alteration seems to have been done in order to allude to the words of the institution of the Eucharist by Christ<sup>(23)</sup>.

<sup>(20)</sup> As regards Heb 9,20: “The author, it is true, shows no sign of direct or explicit concern with the eucharist as regularly celebrated in the church. He is, however, concerned in the passage with the inaugural ceremony of the old covenant, and this strongly suggests a corresponding allusion to the inaugural ceremony of the new covenant, that is, to the initial celebration of the Lord’s Supper” (ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 469). The burden of the present paper, of course, is that since the author of Hebrews is directly and explicitly concerned with the Eucharist (cf. above, n. 16), the inauguration of the old covenant by Moses presages the Eucharistic inauguration of the new by Jesus.

<sup>(21)</sup> The word attributed to Moses in 9,20, λέγω, is to be understood as the usage in which λέγω follows λαλέω in continuing its sense. Cf. above, n. 11.

<sup>(22)</sup> The principle change is the substitution of τοῦτο for ἰδοῦ, of the Septuagint. Interestingly enough, this is not indicated in N-A<sup>27</sup> but it is in *The Greek New Testament*, B. ALAND, K. ALAND, J. KARAVIDOPOULOS, C.M. MARTINI and B.M. METZGER (eds.) (Stuttgart 7<sup>th</sup> printing 2003) 759, a text which is supposed to depend on N-A<sup>27</sup>. Cf. LANE, *Hebrews* 9–13, 245.

<sup>(23)</sup> The reason for the refusal to credit with certitude the change as alluding to the Eucharist is the inability of the authors to see any relevance for an allusion to the Eucharist in Hebrews. The strength of the argument which sees an allusion to the Eucharist does not depend only on the substitution of the New Testament’s τοῦτο for the Septuagint’s ἰδοῦ but on the typology implied. Underlying the text is the supposition that the action of Moses in instituting the old covenant is a prefiguring of Christ instituting the new. Cf. ELLINGWORTH (*Hebrews*, 469) for the authors involved and for the argumentation. Ellingworth observes that the argumentation falls short of “proof”, but that is something which should be taken for granted in any exegetical endeavor: literary analysis by its nature yields plausibility, not proof. An author for whom there is no doubt about the allusion is O. Michel. With regard to the alleged allusion in Heb 9,20 he observes: “Hebr spricht nur in Andeutungen vom Herrenmahl (z.B., 13<sub>10</sub>), doch setzt er Lehre und Feier voraus”. And in a note to this sentence he observes: “Wenn Hebr nicht ausführlich von den Sakramenten spricht, so hängt dies mit der Beschränktheit seines Themas, vielleicht auch mit der Arkandisziplin, auf keinen Fall aber mit einer Gleichgültigkeit gegenüber dem Herrenmahl oder einer unkultischen Beurteilung des Gottesdienstes zusammen. Der Bundesgedanke und die Exegese von Jer 31<sub>31-34</sub> sind nur auf Grund der Abendmahlstiftung, die Polemik Hebr 13<sub>10</sub>

But they refuse to pursue the matter further because they say the author of Hebrews has no particular interest in the Eucharist. The present writer begs to differ and has offered considerations regarding the Eucharist in the epistle<sup>(24)</sup>.

But even apart from the above considerations, which point indirectly to the words of Moses in Heb 3,5 as being compared implicitly to the words of Jesus spoken at the institution of the Eucharist, there is the immediate context of Heb 3,5 which points to Eucharist implications. This immediate context is understood to be Heb 3,1-6. As argued recently in this journal, Heb 3,1-6 has not only a decidedly liturgical caste, but a specifically Eucharistic meaning. The reason for this is the use of the words ἀπόστολος and ἄρχιερεὺς in parallel at the beginning of the passage at Heb 3,1, and the relevance of the word ἀπόστολος to Heb 2,12 and the Christian *tôdâ*, as argued in great detail in the note alluded to above<sup>(25)</sup>.

#### 4. Hebrews 3,5 in the Light of the Structure of Hebrews 1,1-3,6

Considerations about the structure of the first chapters of Hebrews can also be adduced to support a Eucharistic interpretation of Heb 3,5. The framework in which the verse occurs may plausibly be viewed as follows<sup>(26)</sup>:

- 1,1-4: exordium to the entire epistle and to what immediately follows;
- 1,5-14: exposition on Jesus as son [of God];
  - 1,1-4: *paraklêsis* based on preceding exposition;
- 2,5-18: exposition on Jesus as son of man;
- 3,1-5: *paraklêsis* based on the preceding exposition.

In 2,3 there is reference to a salvation which had a beginning of “being spoken” (λαλεῖσθαι) “through the Lord”. The present writer has interpreted these words as an allusion to the Eucharist, which had its beginning with Christ and hence is the beginning of Christian salvation<sup>(27)</sup>. This “beginning of being spoken” indicates that the Christian salvation consisted in words that were uttered by Christ and heard by persons different from the author of the epistle and his addressees (persons referred to as “us” by the author of the epistle). The transmission was of such a solemn type that the author speaks of its being “validated” as it was handed on, a process which suggests tradition<sup>(28)</sup>. In an epistle in which the Eucharist figures prominently a Eucharistic interpretation of a process involving a validation of tradition makes excellent sense<sup>(29)</sup>.

In the context of 2,1-4 the “salvation” referred to is contrasted with

---

nur in Zusammenhang mit einer realistischen Abendmahlehre verständlich” (O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* [KKNT 13; Göttingen 1966] 320).

<sup>(24)</sup> With regard to Heb 13 cf. n. 17 above, and with regard to Heb 2,12 cf.: J. SWETNAM, “Εξ ενός in Hebrews 2,11”, *Bib* 88 (2007) 522-524 and J. SWETNAM, “ὁ ἀπόστολος in Hebrews 3,1”, *Bib* 89 (2008) 255-256.

<sup>(25)</sup> Cf. SWETNAM, “ὁ ἀπόστολος in Hebrews 3,1”, 252-262. This note is to be interpreted with the caution explained in n. 4 at the beginning of this note.

<sup>(26)</sup> Cf. SWETNAM, “Εξ ενός in Hebrews 2,11”, 518.

<sup>(27)</sup> Cf. J. SWETNAM, “The Structure of Hebrews: a Fresh Look”, *Melita Theologica* 41 (1990) 33.

<sup>(28)</sup> Cf. ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 67.

<sup>(29)</sup> Again, cf. note 4 at the beginning of this *animadversio*.

Mosaic Law which also was “validated”, i.e., just as the Mosaic Law was God’s official means of providing for the salvation of the Exodus generation, to the words spoken by Christ are God’s official means of providing for the salvation of the Christians. In 2,1-4 the context is of a word of encouragement on the basis of the son as God (1,5-14). When juxtaposed with the Mosaic Law in contrast, this allusion to the Eucharist would seem to refer to the Eucharist as the divine presence amid God’s people. Just as the “book of the Law” (cf. Heb 9,19) was the symbol of God’s presence among the people of the Exodus generation, so the Eucharist is God’s real presence (cf. Heb 13,8) among the people of the Christian generation who are engaged in their own exodus (cf. Heb 3,6-4,12)<sup>(30)</sup>.

A Eucharistic interpretation of Heb 3,5 would create a parallel to the Eucharistic interpretation at Heb 2,3. But the context would be Jesus as son of man, not as son of God. Just as Heb 2,3 builds on the son as divine to interpret the son as the divine presence for the Christian generation, so Heb 3,5 builds on the son as man to interpret the expiatory effects of the Eucharistic blood (cf. Heb 2,17 and Heb 9,19), effects which are made possible by the son’s blood and flesh (cf. Heb 2,14)<sup>(31)</sup>. Thus the relevance of Heb 3,5 for Heb 2,13b-18 (expiation of sin based on Christ’s blood) matches the relevance of Heb 3,5 for Heb 9,20 (purification of the blood sprinkled by Moses).

Finally, this interpretation of the words τῶν λαληθησομένων in Heb 3,5 would illumine the use of λαλεῖσθαι at Heb 2,3: the “speaking” in Heb 2,3 refers to God “speaking in a son” just the “speaking” in Heb 3,5 refers to God “speaking in a prophet”, with the latter speaking foreshadowing the former.

\*  
\* \*

The present note has attempted to interpret the words τῶν λαληθησομένων in Heb 3,5 in a Eucharistic sense. Four complementary approaches were suggested as a way to understand Heb 3,5:

1) the relevance of Num 12,7 [LXX] as used in Heb 3,1-6 (the author of Hebrews uses the text as the source of his vocabulary to contrast Moses and the “son”, i.e., Jesus);

2) the relevance of the thematic use of the word λαλέω in Hebrews (it is used of God’s speaking “in the prophets” and “in a son”;

3) the relevance of Heb 9,19-20 (the only instance in Hebrews where Moses is said to “speak” [λαλέω] is in a context in which the Eucharist is plausibly seen as being alluded to) makes a good pairing with the words of Moses in 3,5 which occur in a context in which the Eucharist is a key them);

4) the relevance of the structure of Heb 3,1-3,6 (a Eucharistic allusion at Heb 3,5 would match a Eucharistic allusion at Heb 2,3). All of this argumentation was set against the present writer’s Eucharistic interpretations of Heb 13 and Heb 2,12 previously published elsewhere.

<sup>(30)</sup> The vocabulary of Heb 2,4 also conveys the idea that the Christians are engaged in an exodus which mirrors the first Exodus. Cf. ATTRIDGE, *Hebrews*, 67. n. 60.

<sup>(31)</sup> The well-known inversion of the “blood and flesh” instead of “flesh and blood” in Heb 2,14 is probably caused by the author’s desire to call attention to the role of the son’s blood in expiating sin in what follows. Cf. ELLINGWORTH, *Hebrews*, 171.

The conclusion to be drawn from the above presentation is that the Eucharist is a key element in the understanding of Heb 3,5 as it is in Heb 2,3; Heb 2,12; and Heb 13.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Roma

JAMES SWETNAM

#### SUMMARY

The words τῶν λαληθησομένων in Heb 3,5 allude to the words of Christ at the institution of the Eucharist. This is argued from 1) the contrast between Christ and Moses in Heb 3,1-6 as understood against the background of Num 12,7[LXX]; 2) the thematic use of λαλέω in Hebrews; 3) the relevance of Heb 9,20; 4) the place of Heb 3,5 in the structure of Heb 1,1-3,6. All to be understood against a Eucharistic interpretation of Heb 2,12 and Heb 13.



## Comparison of Humans to Animals in 2 Peter 2,10b-22

A striking feature of 2 Peter 2,10b-22 is the author's multiple references to similarities and differences between humans and animals. In this passage the author of 2 Peter continues and concludes the criticism of the people he calls "false teachers" that he began in 2,1. In 2,12 the author compares the false teachers to irrational animals. In 2,16 he develops the point that the false teachers are followers of Balaam by observing that a voiceless donkey prevented the madness of Balaam, implicitly contrasting the false teachers with the donkey. And finally in 2,22 the author says that a proverb about the behavior of a dog and a sow applies to those who follow the false teachers and by implication to the false teachers themselves.

In his critique of the false teachers in 2,1-22, the author of 2 Peter is dependent on Jude 4-16<sup>(1)</sup>. He has taken the comparison of the false teachers to irrational animals from Jude 10. He has also taken the connection of the false teachers to Balaam from Jude 11. Jude, however, mentions Balaam very briefly and makes no reference to Balaam's donkey; the author of 2 Peter has described Balaam more fully and specifically included the behavior of the donkey. The author of 2 Peter has added the proverb to the material he took from Jude. Thus, by comparison with Jude the author of 2 Peter has greatly increased the use of animal references in his polemic. This use of animals was probably suggested to him by Jude 10, but he has made it much more prominent than it was in Jude.

In what follows I will illuminate this aspect of 2 Peter 2,10b-22 by investigating comparison of humans to animals by writers older than, and (roughly) contemporary with, 2 Peter. This will bring 2 Peter's references to animals into sharper focus.

### 1. *Like irrational animals (2 Pet 2,12)*

In Jude 10 the author says that those he criticizes are like irrational animals in that they know some things naturally (ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα ἐπίστανται). The author also says that his opponents are destroyed by these things they know naturally. It is unclear whether or not this is also true of the irrational animals. If it is, this is another way that the opponents resemble irrational animals. 2 Peter's revision of this in 2,12 explicitly says that the false teachers are like irrational animals in being destined by their nature for destruction. The author of 2 Peter eliminated any reference to irrational animals' knowing things naturally; perhaps he did not think it appropriate to speak of irrational animals as having knowledge. Instead he says that they are begotten naturally for capture and corruption (ὡς ἄλογα ζῶα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθοράν). To this the author adds that the

<sup>(1)</sup> On this see T. CALLAN, "Use of the Letter of Jude by the Second Letter of Peter", *Bib* 85 (2004) 42-64.

false teachers will be corrupted in the corruption of the irrational animals (ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρῆσονται).

In Greek λόγος means both reason and speech; the latter is an outward expression of the former<sup>(2)</sup>. The idea that humans are distinguished from other animals in that humans reason and speak (i.e., are λογικοί) while other animals do not goes back at least to Aristotle (see e.g. *De Anima* 433A; *Nicomachean Ethics* 1111B) and was strongly affirmed by the Stoics (see e.g., Epictetus 1.2.1). Others, especially Platonists, rejected the distinction<sup>(3)</sup>. For example, in the dialogue *De Animalibus* 10-71 Philo of Alexandria's nephew Alexander presents an extensive argument that animals are rational<sup>(4)</sup>. Likewise, Plutarch argues that animals are rational in *De sollertia animalium* (Moralia 959-985) and *Bruta animalia ratione uti* (Moralia 985-992)<sup>(5)</sup>.

Some such arguments acknowledge that animals do not speak as humans do, but maintain that animals do reason. Thus the Greek title of Plutarch, *Bruta animalia ratione uti* – Περὶ τοῦ τὰ ἄλογα λόγῳ χρῆσθαι – designates animals as ἄλογα even as it proposes that animals use λόγος (cf. also 992C)<sup>(6)</sup>. Other arguments that animals are rational maintain that at least some animals speak. Thus Alexander in Philo, *De Animalibus* 13-15 argues that birds are capable of rational utterance, and Plutarch, *De sollertia animalium* argues that starlings, crows and parrots are endowed with rational utterance (προφορικὸς λόγος) (972F-973E).

The idea that animals are irrational is not found in the Hebrew bible, but was taken up by Hellenistic Jews. For example, in *De Animalibus* 77-100 Philo rejects his nephew Alexander's argument that animals are rational. Likewise, Wis 11,15-16 says that God punished the Egyptians' worship of irrational serpents and worthless animals by means of irrational animals so they might learn that one is punished by the very things by which one sins. There are many other references to irrational animals in Hellenistic Jewish literature<sup>(7)</sup>. It is presumably from here that Jude has derived the idea that animals are irrational, and 2 Peter has derived it from Jude.

<sup>(2)</sup> On the relationship between reason and speech see R. SORABJI, *Animal Minds and Human Morals*. The Origins of the Western Debate (Ithaca, NY 1993) 80-86. U. Dierauer says that in its earliest use, the designation of animals as ἄλογα meant that they lacked speech (U. DIERAUER, *Tier und Mensch im Denken der Antike*. Studien zur Tierpsychologie, Anthropologie und Ethik [Amsterdam 1977] 33).

<sup>(3)</sup> For detailed discussion of the dispute and its ramifications, see SORABJI, *Animal Minds*; cf. also R.M. GRANT, *Early Christians and Animals* (London & New York 1999) 9-11.

<sup>(4)</sup> For this treatise see A. TERIAN, *Philonis Alexandrini De Animalibus*. The Armenian Text with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary (Chico, CA 1981). The text and translation of Philo's other writings are taken from the LCL, as are the text and translation of other Greek and Latin writers cited in this essay as far as possible.

<sup>(5)</sup> The view that animals are rational can easily be seen to imply that one should abstain from eating animal flesh. Plutarch makes such an argument in *De esu carnium orationes* I and II (Moralia 993A-999B) as does Porphyry in *On Abstinence from Animal Food*.

<sup>(6)</sup> Animals are also called ἄλογα in the Greek title of Philo, *De Animalibus*. They are also said to have λόγος in Plutarch, *Bruta animalia ratione uti* 991F, 992D-E.

<sup>(7)</sup> See 4 Macc 14,14, 18; Philo, *Post.* 161; *Abr.* 266-7; *Mos.* 1.272; *Spec. Leg.* 1.148; 2.69; 4.121; *Virt.* 81, 117, 125, 133, 140, 148, 160; Josephus *Ap.* 2.213; *Ant.* 10.262.

The author of 2 Peter describes irrational animals as begotten naturally for capture and corruption. This is not a common idea about animals, though it is not unparalleled. Aristotle argued that animals exist for the sake of humans (see Aristotle, *Politics* 1256B), meaning that they exist to be eaten as well as to provide service, clothes and tools. The Stoics held a similar view. According to Plutarch, the Stoics (he specifically mentions Chrysippus) maintain that the pig by nature (φύσει) has come to be in order to be killed and eaten (Fragment 193). Richard Bauckham says the idea that certain animals were born to be slaughtered and eaten was common in the ancient world and cites three examples: Juvenal 1.141; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 8.81; and BM 85a<sup>(8)</sup>. The first of these speaks of boars as an animal born for the sake of banquets (*apros, animal propter convivium natum*). The second says concerning rabbits that nature has generated fertile animals that are harmless and good to eat (*natura innocua et esculenta animalia fecunda generavit*). The third presents Rabbi Judah the Prince as telling a calf that was being taken to be slaughtered that the calf had been created for this.

These passages certainly speak of animals as born to be slaughtered and eaten, and this is generally similar to what 2 Peter says. However, 2 Peter says specifically that animals are born for capture and corruption. "Capture" seems to imply that animals are born to be hunted, either by humans or by other animals. "Corruption" refers to disintegration that results either from being eaten or simply from decay<sup>(9)</sup>. The author of 2 Peter seems most concerned to portray animals as mortal, destined for death and decay. This is similar in thought, but not language, to what is said in Ps 49,12.20 — "Mortals cannot abide in their pomp; they are like the animals that perish". In the Greek translation of this psalm, though not in the Hebrew text, the animals are explicitly described as irrational (τοῖς κτήνεσιν τοῖς ἀνοήτοις — Ps 48,13.21). In *Targum Neofiti 1* on Numbers, Balaam's donkey refers to itself as an unclean beast that dies in this world and does not enter the world to come in contrasting itself to the children of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob<sup>(10)</sup>. This is quite similar to the thought of 2 Peter though the targums do not explicitly refer to the donkey as irrational.

Comparison of humans to irrational animals is fairly common and serves various purposes<sup>(11)</sup>. Sometimes the point is simply that humans are unlike irrational animals because they are rational. Epictetus argues that rational and irrational animals have in common such things as eating, drinking, resting and sexual intercourse, but only rational animals have understanding (1.6.12-22; cf. 4.7.7). At other times the point is that humans are enough like irrational animals that behavior toward the latter should be a pattern for the way one

<sup>(8)</sup> R.J. BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC 50; Waco, TX 1983) 263.

<sup>(9)</sup> On this see T. CALLAN, "The Soteriology of the Second Letter of Peter", *Bib* 82 (2001) 549-559, especially 550-552.

<sup>(10)</sup> *Targum Neofiti 1: Numbers* translated, with Apparatus and Notes by M. McNAMARA; *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Numbers* translated, with Notes by E.G. Clarke (Collegeville, MN 1995) 127. Cf. the similar statement in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* (254).

<sup>(11)</sup> Of course, those who maintain that animals are rational frequently compare humans and animals, but they are not comparing humans to what they regard as irrational animals. Plutarch's comparison of humans to pigs in *Bruta animalia ratione uti* is discussed below.

treats humans. In *Spec. Leg.* 4.121 Philo says that one should learn from dealing with irrational animals how to deal with humans (cf. Josephus, *Ap.* 2.213). Philo argues that the Mosaic laws concerning proper treatment of irrational animals and plants are intended to train people in proper treatment of one another (*Virt.* 131-134, 140, 160). At still other times the point is that some humans are like animals in lacking rationality. In *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae* Plutarch says that enticing a mob by currying favor with it rather than by persuasion is like catching and herding irrational animals (*Moralia* 802E). Galen says that children, who do not yet have reason, fight with one another like animals (*De Placitis Hippocrates et Platonis* 5.5.1-5). *Corpus Hermeticum* 4.5 describes those who are not gnostics as having perceptions like those of irrational animals.

Most often humans are compared with irrational animals to make some more specific point. Sometimes humans are compared with irrational animals to say that they possess some good quality of animals, or even that they are inferior to animals in possessing some good quality. 4 Macc 14.14.18 says that irrational animals and humans are alike in having sympathy and love for their offspring. In *Ant.* 10.262 Josephus says that even the irrational lions who consumed the enemies of Daniel considered the wickedness of those enemies a reason for punishing them. In this way he suggests that these irrational creatures regard wickedness the same way humans should. In *Post.* 161 Philo says that irrational creatures are greatly superior to humans with regard to the senses of hearing and smell (cf. also *Abr.* 266-267). Similarly Plutarch says that nature is a stepmother to humans, but a mother to irrational animals because of the animals' size, speed and vision (Fragment 121). In *De amore prolis*, Plutarch argues that irrational animals follow nature more closely than do rational ones (*Moralia* 493B-E). Elsewhere Plutarch says that humans should imitate irrational animals (Fragment 118) and in *De Stoicorum repugnantiis* he criticizes the Stoics because they do not consistently use the behavior of irrational animals as a model for human behavior (*Moralia* 1045B). 2 Peter 2.16 invokes this kind of positive comparison of humans and irrational animals; Balaam's donkey, which is sometimes called an irrational animal (Philo, *Mos.* 1.272; *Virt.* 117), is presented as superior to Balaam in this verse.

At other times humans are compared to irrational animals to say that they possess some bad quality of animals, especially their excessive appetite. For example, in *Spec. Leg.* 1.148 Philo compares desire to a licentious and unseemly irrational animal (ἄλόγου θύμματος) and says that the belly is its manger. Musonius Rufus says that we liken gluttons to unreasoning animals (ζώοις ἄφοροι — 18B)<sup>(12)</sup>. Clement of Alexandria says that humans who live in order to eat are like irrational animals whose life is their belly and nothing else (*Paidagog.* 2.1.4).

2 Peter's comparison of the false teachers to irrational animals falls into this general category. However, the specific way in which they resemble irrational animals is very different. As we have seen above, the main point of

<sup>(12)</sup> The text and translation of Musonius Rufus are taken from C.E. LUTZ, *Musonius Rufus "The Roman Socrates"* (Yale Classical Studies 10; New Haven, CT 1947).

comparison is that both irrational animals and the false teachers are destined for death and decay. In other words, they are alike in having this inherent character. I have found no close parallel to a comparison of this kind; the closest is Psalm 49, which is quoted and discussed above. The reason may be that many would simply take it for granted that humans and animals are alike in this way. Those who thought they differed in this respect would not make such a comparison. It would mainly arise where humans could either be like or unlike animals in this way. 2 Peter thinks that Christians are destined to escape death and decay, to be sharers in divine nature (see 2 Peter 1,5). But the false teachers will not share this destiny; instead they will be like irrational animals.

## 2. Like Balaam's donkey (2 Pet 2,16)

Jude 11 says about those it criticizes that "they go the way of Cain, and abandon themselves to Balaam's error for the sake of gain, and perish in Korah's rebellion." 2 Peter's revision of this in 2,16 eliminates the references to Cain and Korah and expands the reference to Balaam. Presumably comparison of the false teachers to Balaam served the author's purpose better than the triple comparison made by Jude<sup>(13)</sup>. Expanding the reference to Balaam also allowed the author of 2 Peter to mention Balaam's donkey explicitly. This enabled him to develop the theme of comparing the false teachers to animals. As I have noted above, this comparison emphasizes a positive feature of an animal.

In describing Balaam's donkey, the author of 2 Peter says that Balaam received a rebuke of his lawbreaking when a voiceless donkey having spoken with a human's voice prevented the madness of the prophet (ὁποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ ὁθεγζόμενον ἐκώλυσε τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν). The author of 2 Peter has taken this from Num 22,28-30. These verses tell how the Lord opened the mouth of Balaam's donkey to reproach Balaam for beating the donkey. It is possible that this beating is what the author of 2 Peter means by Balaam's lawbreaking and his madness. However, it seems more likely that the author understands lawbreaking and madness more broadly. If so, he probably presumes the elaboration of the story of Balaam in non-biblical sources in which the donkey rebukes Balaam for his general failings, not simply for beating the donkey. According to Bauckham the targums to Num 22,30 attribute to the donkey a speech in which she rebukes Balaam for his foolishness<sup>(14)</sup>. In *Targum Neofiti* the donkey rebukes Balaam for lacking understanding and argues that if Balaam is unable to curse the donkey, he will surely be unable to curse the Israelites. The donkey's speech in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* is quite similar<sup>(15)</sup>.

One indication that the author of 2 Peter is not directly dependent on the biblical text at this point is that he uses the word ὁποζύγιον for Balaam's

<sup>(13)</sup> On this see T.S. CAULLEY, "'They Promise Them Freedom': Once Again the ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι in 2 Peter", *ZNW* 99 (2007) 129-138.

<sup>(14)</sup> BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 268. Bauckham mentions specifically *Frg. Tg.*, *Tg. Ps.-J.*, *Tg. Neof.*

<sup>(15)</sup> *Targum Neofiti* I, 127, 254.

donkey; the LXX uses ὄνος as does Josephus (see *Ant.* 4.109-110). However, Josephus speaks of the donkey as having a φωνὴν ἀνθρωπίνην; these are very close to the words used by 2 Peter and are not found in the biblical text. Philo uses ὑποζύγιον in reference to Balaam's donkey (*Mos.* 1.169). When Philo treats the words of the donkey as a rebuke spoken by various life pursuits in *Cher.* 35, they rebuke the person as proud-necked.

2 Peter's point is that the donkey acted more righteously than did Balaam; Balaam was inferior to the donkey in this respect, as are the false teachers who follow Balaam. We have noted above that Philo refers to Balaam's donkey as an irrational animal. The story of Balaam is an instance of an irrational animal's being superior to the false teachers. They are not like this particular irrational animal, but are inferior to it.

The author of 2 Peter describes the donkey as voiceless. This probably does not mean that the donkey is incapable of making a sound, but rather that it is incapable of speech. As we have noted above, in Greek thought speech and rationality were closely related. Thus, in *On Abstinence from Animal Food* 3.3, Porphyry says that voice (φωνή) is external reason (προφορικὸς λόγος). The description of the donkey as voiceless may be intended to indicate that it was irrational<sup>(16)</sup>.

### 3. Like a dog and a sow (2 Pet 2,22)

2 Peter 2,22 is one of the author's additions to the material he adapted from Jude. It is the culmination of his critique of the false teachers and of his comparison of them to animals. The author says concerning the followers of the false teachers and the false teachers themselves that the meaning of the true proverb has applied to them: a dog having turned back to his own vomit, and a sow, having been washed, to wallowing in the mud (συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας, Κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα, καί, Ὑς λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου).

The first part of the proverb comes from the bible, specifically from Prov 26,11; the second part apparently comes from *The Story of Ahikar* 8.15/18. Neither source is cited verbatim; Bauckham thinks the two may have been combined by Hellenistic Jews before 2 Peter used the combination<sup>(17)</sup>. One thing suggesting this is that the author refers to this as a single proverb although it has two distinct parts.

Dogs and pigs are among the specific animals described as irrational with which humans are compared in the passages discussed above in connection with 2 Peter 2,12. Dogs are the irrational animals with which humans are compared with respect to good qualities in Philo, *Post.* 161; *Abr.* 266-267; *Spec. Leg.* 4.121; and Plutarch, *De amore prolis* 493C. Pigs are the irrational animals with which humans are compared with respect to bad qualities in

<sup>(16)</sup> In the passage cited Porphyry is arguing that since animals have voices, they are therefore rational. He specifically mentions canine and bovine speech alongside barbarian and Greek. As was noted above, a similar argument is found in Philo, *De Animalibus* and Plutarch, *De sollertia animalium*. In *Politics* 1253A Aristotle separates voice and reason. He says that animals have voice (φωνή) but not speech (λόγος) that manifests reason.

<sup>(17)</sup> BAUCKHAM, *Jude*, 2 Peter, 273.

Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1.148. Both dogs and pigs are mentioned negatively in Musonius Rufus 18B.

In addition to these passages, humans are often compared to dogs and pigs when the latter are not specifically called irrational animals. And these comparisons follow a pattern similar to that of the passages mentioned above: humans are compared to dogs with respect to both positive and negative qualities; humans are almost always compared to pigs with respect to negative qualities<sup>(18)</sup>.

One specific context in which humans are compared to dogs and pigs, as well as other animals, is that of physiognomy, the assessment of persons' character from their outer appearance. One of the methods of doing this is to infer the relationship between appearance and character in humans from the relationship between the two in animals, on the assumption that the two are similar. In pursuing this approach to physiognomy, the inferences based on dogs and pigs are sometimes positive, sometimes negative. In the case of the dog, the two are approximately equal; in the case of the pig the latter preponderate.

#### a) Comparison of humans to dogs

Otto Keller divides dogs in the ancient world into five large groups: Spitz-type dogs, shepherd's dogs, street dogs, greyhounds and mastiffs<sup>(19)</sup>. Humans are usually compared negatively to street dogs; they are compared positively to other kinds of dogs.

Humans are also compared to dogs in a neutral way. Judg 7,5 speaks about humans lapping water like a dog. In *Somn.* 1.108 Philo says that just as barking is peculiar to a dog, so is reasoning to a human. Seneca makes a similar point somewhat more elaborately in *Epistles* 76. In *Somn.* 2.267 Philo interprets the statement about a dog in Exod 11,7 as referring to the tongue that is dog-like in barking so loud. Musonius Rufus argues that just as the trainers of dogs make no distinction in the training of male and female, so women should study philosophy (4, *Lutz* 44-45). And Musonius argues that just as a dog was not created for pleasure, neither were humans (17, *Lutz* 106-109). Epictetus frequently draws conclusions about human beings from the characteristics and behavior of dogs. For example, in 1.2.34 he argues that humans differ in their abilities by asking if all dogs are skilled in tracking. In 2.23.24 he argues that human faculties are all useful though differing in value by saying that a dog is useful though less so than a slave. In 3.1.1-6, 23, 45 he argues that human beauty consists in possessing the excellence proper to a human by saying that this is true of dogs. Similar arguments are found in 3.26.26; 4.1.85 and 124; 4.8.42.

*Odyssey* 20.9-13 compares the heart of Odysseus, filled with wrath

<sup>(18)</sup> In contemporary English usage as in first century Greek and Latin, comparing someone to a pig is almost always negative — e.g., making a pig of oneself, pigging out, sweating like a pig, male chauvinist pig — but comparing someone to a dog is more positive than in the first century — e.g., dogged determination. This is based on the more favorable estimate of dogs in our culture — the dog is man's best friend. However, the negative comparison is still found — e.g., son of a bitch.

<sup>(19)</sup> O. KELLER, *Die Antike Tierwelt* (Hildesheim 1963) 1.91.

against evil deeds, to a dog defending her puppies. According to Keller, Plautus and Horace use "little dog" (*catellus*) as a term of endearment for humans. And Pindar refers to Pan as the unexcelled dog of the great gods<sup>(20)</sup>. Another example of a positive comparison of humans to dogs is found in Philo, *Dec.* 114-115; here Philo says that humans should imitate the example of dogs who guard their masters and die for them.

In Pseudo-Aristotle, *Physiognomica* the following physical characteristics are said to indicate positive traits on the basis that this is true of dogs:

- a deep voice goes with courage (807A)
- a narrow waist marks the hunter (810B)
- lips thin and pendulous such that part of the upper lip overhangs the lower signify pride of soul (811A)
- a somewhat long, flat forehead means quickness of sense (811B)
- a large head means quickness (812A)
- hair on the point of the chin indicates a bold spirit (812B).

Negative comparisons of humans to dogs focus on several aspects of canine behavior. In *Gig.* 35 Philo says that undisciplined pleasures are like dogs in that they fawn on us then turn against us and their bite is fatal. Bad rulers are compared to dogs in the same respect in *Prob.* 90. In 2.22.9 Epictetus compares the changeable dispositions of humans to dogs that first play with one another and then begin to fight over a piece of meat thrown among them. Humans are also compared to mad dogs. In *Contemp.* 40 Philo says that under the influence of drink some humans behave like mad dogs, bellowing and attacking and biting each other. Other comparisons of humans with mad dogs are found in Horace, *Epistles* 2.2.75; Josephus, *B.J.* 6.196; *Ant.* 7.209; Ignatius, *Eph* 7.1 and Augustine, *City of God* 22.21<sup>(21)</sup>.

Humans are also described as like dogs in being shameless. In *Ap.* 2.85 Josephus says that Apion displays the shamelessness of a dog (see also Horace, *Epistles* 1.2.26). Humans are particularly like dogs with respect to their shameless eating and sexual activity. In *B.J.* 5.526 Josephus says that those besieged in Jerusalem continued like dogs to maul the carcass of the people<sup>(22)</sup>. In *Ant.* 12.213 Josephus says that Hyrcanus accused his fellow diners of eating bones along with meat like dogs, while he discarded the bones like a human. In *Epistles* 72 Seneca says that foolish humans behave like dogs in waiting eagerly for whatever Fortune may throw them, bolting it, and then waiting for more; the wise man, however, is indifferent to what may come his way. Musonius Rufus says that gluttons imitate the shameless greediness of dogs (18B, *Lutz* 116-117)<sup>(23)</sup>. In *City of God* 14.20 Augustine says that Cynics hold the shameless view, worthy of dogs, that no one should

<sup>(20)</sup> KELLER, *Antike Tierwelt*, 1.128.

<sup>(21)</sup> In *De sollertia animalium* 963C-F Plutarch argues that one would not speak of a dog as having become mad if the dog were not rational to begin with.

<sup>(22)</sup> Dogs are very often described as eaters of carrion; this may be one of the main reasons referring to someone as a dog is usually pejorative. For instances of this in the bible see Exod 22.31; 1 Kgs 16.4; 20.19.23.24.38; 2 Kgs 9.10.36; Ps 68.23; Jer 15.3. This presentation of dogs is also frequent in Josephus, sometimes in direct dependence on the bible. For examples of this see *B.J.* 4.324; 6.637; *Ant.* 6.187; 8.270, 289, 361, 407 (= 1 Kgs 20.19), 417; 9.124 (= 1 Kgs 20.23); 15.289. See also Luke 16.21 where dogs are said to lick the sores of Lazarus.

<sup>(23)</sup> Dogs are described as greedy in Isa 56.11; see also Philo, *Mos.* 1.130.



be ashamed to engage in sexual intercourse in a public place. The dog that is mentioned in Deut 23,18 (Hebrew v. 19) may be a reference to a male prostitute who is called a dog because his behavior is similar to that of a dog<sup>(24)</sup>.

In addition to negative comparison of humans with dogs focusing on the aggressiveness and shamelessness of dogs, there are other comparisons that do not make explicit the behavior that makes them alike. It is likely, however, that aggressiveness and shamelessness form at least part of the basis for these unspecific comparisons. One example of this can be seen in the use of the name Cynic (= dog-like) for a philosophical school<sup>(25)</sup>. In 1 Sam 17,43 Goliath asks David if Goliath is a dog that David comes to fight him with sticks. In the LXX David replies that Goliath is worse than a dog. This is reproduced by Josephus in *Ant.* 6.186. Such general derogatory comparison of humans with dogs can also be seen in a number of other biblical passages that denigrate humans as lowly<sup>(26)</sup>. In other passages the comparison implies that humans have an evil character<sup>(27)</sup>. In all of these passages people are presented as comparable to dogs in some unspecified, but negative, way<sup>(28)</sup>.

In Pseudo-Aristotle, *Physiognomica* the following physical characteristics are said to indicate negative traits on the basis that this is true of dogs:

- a projecting upper lip and gums mark the abusive (811A)
- if the tip of the nose is pointed, it means irascibility (811A)
- a smooth brow marks the flatterer (811B)
- fiery eyes mean impudence (808B)

Note that except for Prov 26,11 people are not said to be like dogs specifically in that they return to their own vomit. One of the main ways in which humans are compared to dogs is with respect to their repulsive eating habits; however, returning to their own vomit is mentioned only in Proverbs and 2 Peter<sup>(29)</sup>.

#### b) Comparison of humans to pigs

A rather elaborate instance of positive comparison of humans and pigs is found in Plutarch, *Bruta animalia ratione uti* (Moralia 985-992), in which Plutarch argues that pigs and other animals are rational, not irrational. In this dialogue Odysseus tries to persuade Circe to transform the humans she has turned into animals back into humans. According to the Odyssey, Circe had turned half of Odysseus' men into pigs and had earlier turned other humans into other animals. Circe tells Odysseus that she will turn them back into men

<sup>(24)</sup> J.B. BURNS, "Devotee or Deviate: The 'Dog' (*keleb*) in Ancient Israel as a Symbol of Male Passivity and Perversion", *Journal of Religion and Society* 2 (2000). <http://moses.creighton.edu/JRS/2000/2000-6.html>.

<sup>(25)</sup> On this see DIERAUER, *Tier und Mensch*, 181.

<sup>(26)</sup> 1 Sam 24,14; 2 Sam 3,8; 9,8; 16,9; 2 Kgs 8,13; Mark 7,27/Matt 15,26. The lowliness of dogs is implied in Qoh 9,4 — "a living dog is better than a dead lion".

<sup>(27)</sup> Ps 22,16,20; Ps 59,6,14; Phil 3,3; Rev 22,15.

<sup>(28)</sup> KELLER (*Antike Tierwelt*, 1.98) lists some additional instances in which humans and others are called dogs either to denigrate them or to indicate their evil character; see also DIERAUER, *Tier und Mensch*, 11 n. 27.

<sup>(29)</sup> *Gos. Truth* 33.15-16 says, "Do not return to what you have vomited to eat it". This converts the description of behavior found in Proverbs and 2 Peter into a warning against that behavior, but without mentioning that this is the behavior of a dog.

if he can persuade the animals that this is best. So that Odysseus can make his argument, Circe enables one of the animals to talk<sup>(30)</sup>. This is apparently a pig called Gryllus (= grunter or pig).

Gryllus responds to Odysseus' first effort to persuade by saying that Odysseus is trying to worsen, not improve, their situation by turning them back into humans, who are the most unfortunate of all animals. Odysseus answers by suggesting that it may have been a pre-existing inclination to swinishness that caused him to become a pig (986D-E). Later Odysseus expresses admiration of Gryllus' argumentative ability despite his present swinishness (988E-F). These are instances of the negative comparison of humans to pigs. Gryllus rejects this slur and goes on to argue that beasts surpass humans in courage. In support of this Gryllus says that courage is found among both male and female beasts and so is natural to them; he cites as an example the sow of Crommyon (987F). Gryllus also points out that poets say a man is like a boar in valour, but never that a boar is like a man in valour (988D)<sup>(31)</sup>. Later Gryllus argues that animals surpass humans in temperance. One example is that sows attract boars without the use of artificial fragrances. The two are attracted to the nuptial union by mutual affection. Both celebrate at the proper time a love without deceit or hire. After conception they cease sexual intercourse. Nor is homosexual mating found among beasts (990C-D)<sup>(32)</sup>.

Humans are compared with pigs negatively, as they are with dogs, with respect to their aggressiveness, their eating habits and their sexual behavior. The LXX of 2 Sam 17,8 compares David's soldiers to a savage pig on the plain. In *Somn.* 2.87-89 Philo says that some humans are more fierce and malicious than wild boars. In *LevR* 13 (114c) the pig of Lev 11,7 is interpreted as referring to Rome because Rome is a thief, a housebreaker and a robber. Likewise in *ARN* 34 the wild boar of Ps 80,13 (Hebrew v. 14) is interpreted as referring to Rome because the boar injures and kills people<sup>(33)</sup>. According to the *Epistle of Barnabas* 10.1-3, Moses prohibited eating pig (χοῖρον)<sup>(34)</sup> in Lev 11,7 and Deut 14,8 to prohibit association with humans who are like pigs in ignoring their owner when they have food and squealing when they are hungry. Musonius Rufus says (18B, *Lutz* 116-117) that gluttons behave like pigs. In *Spec. Leg.* 3.36 and 113 Philo says that those who have sexual intercourse for pleasure rather than for procreation behave like pigs<sup>(35)</sup>.

<sup>(30)</sup> This ability to talk is referred to as producing and understanding speech (λόγον), something animals are ordinarily not able to do (986B).

<sup>(31)</sup> Idomeneus is compared to a boar in this way in *Iliad* 13.470-475. In Pseudo-Aristotle, *Physiognomica* coarse hair is said to indicate courage as can be seen from the coarse hair of the wild boar (806B).

<sup>(32)</sup> Similar positive presentations of the sexual temperance of animals, but without explicit reference to pigs, are found in Plato, *Laws* 840D-E, Philo, *De Animalibus* 48-49 and Plutarch, *De amore prolis* 493E-F.

<sup>(33)</sup> Philo refers to the aggressive behavior of boars in *Prov.* 2.57; *De Animalibus* 51, 70 but without comparing it to human behavior. On the aggressive behavior of wild pigs in the ancient world see KELLER, *Antike Tierwelt*, 1.389-393.

<sup>(34)</sup> That this word is synonymous with the more common ὄζ/σὺς is indicated by the use of the two with the same meaning in the same context in Josephus, *Ap.* 2.137 and 141.

<sup>(35)</sup> Pseudo-Aristotle, *Physiognomica* 808B says that violent sexual excitability is found in pigs.

In addition to these ways of comparing humans with pigs that are similar to the ways they are compared with dogs, humans are also compared with pigs in preferring to live in dirt. In *Republic* 535E Plato says of someone who does not mind being found ignorant that he rolls in the mud of ignorance like a pig (θηρίον ῥετον) (cf. *Laws* 819D). In *Ag.* 144-145 Philo says that Moses compares sophists to swine because they are at home in a mode of life that is thick and muddy and in all that is most ugly. In *Spec. Leg.* 148 he says that desire like a pig rejoices to make its home in the mire. And Musonius Rufus speaks (12, *Lutz* 86-87) of humans as being like swine and rejoicing in their own vileness. See also Horace, *Epistles* 1.2.26; 2.2.75; Epictetus 4.11.11, 29, 31. This is close to the comparison implied in 2 Peter, but lacks the specific idea of returning to the mud after having been washed.

As is the case with comparison of humans to dogs, humans are sometimes compared with pigs without specifying the negative behavior of the pigs that the comparison presumes. Very likely the aggressiveness, shamelessness and liking for dirt are at least part of the basis for this. Thus Prov 11,22 says that a beautiful woman without good sense is like a gold ring in a pig's snout<sup>(36)</sup>.

In Pseudo-Aristotle, *Physiognomica* the following physical characteristics are said to indicate negative traits on the basis that this is true of pigs:

- lips thin and hard are a sign of base breeding (811A)
- a nose thick from the tip means dullness of sense (811A)
- a small forehead means stupidity (811B)
- eyebrows that droop on the nasal and rise on the temporal side indicate silliness (812B).

#### c) Comparison of humans to both dogs and pigs

In view of the similar ways humans are compared with dogs and pigs, it is not surprising that the two are sometimes mentioned together as they are in 2 Peter<sup>(37)</sup>. The 7<sup>th</sup> century BCE poet Semonides speaks of ten different types of women or wives as deriving from eight different animals along with the earth and sea (Fragment 7). Two of the animals are the pig and the dog. The wife derived from the pig is dirty and eats too much. She lies in mud (βορβόρω) throughout her house and wallows (κυλίνδεται) in it. She sits on a dunghill and grows fat. The wife derived from the dog wants to stick her nose in everything and barks incessantly. Later the wife derived from the sea is said at times to be as ferocious as a dog with puppies.

In Matt 7,6 Jesus says, "Do not give what is holy to dogs; and do not throw your pearls before swine (χοίρων), or they will trample them under foot and turn and maul you"<sup>(38)</sup>. Here the people referred to as dogs and swine are

<sup>(36)</sup> KELLER (*Antike Tierwelt*, 1.404) mentions a couple of instances in which humans are called pigs to denigrate them. A generally negative assessment of pigs is implied by the proverb cited by Plato (*Laches* 196D) "any pig would know".

<sup>(37)</sup> They are sometimes mentioned together without comparing them to human beings. In the LXX of 1 Kgs 20,19; 22,38 it says that sows and dogs eat blood; only dogs are mentioned in the Hebrew text, and the former passage is 21,19. In *De Animalibus* Philo speaks of the wild boar and dog as well as other animals. P Oxy 840, lines 33-34 mentions waters into which dogs and pigs are thrown day and night. On dogs and pigs see GRANT, *Christians and Animals*, 6-7.

<sup>(38)</sup> On this verse see H. VON LIPS, "Schweine füttert man, Hunde nicht – ein Versuch, das Rätsel von Matthäus 7<sup>o</sup> zu lösen", *ZNW* 79 (1988) 165-186.

seen as like those animals in their aggressive behavior<sup>(39)</sup>. In *Epistles* 1.2.26 Horace says that Ulysses, if he had drunk from Circe's cup, would have lived like a filthy dog or a hog delighting in mire. In *Epistles* 2.2.75 he describes the busy streets of Rome by saying that here runs a mad dog, there rushes a sow begrimed with mire. Musonius Rufus in 18B (LUTZ, 116-117) says that gluttons are greedy like swine or dogs. Epictetus contrasts the behavior of dog and pig, saying that the former does not roll in the mud (κυλιέται ἐν βορβόρῳ) while the latter does; humans should imitate the former (4.11.31). Shab 155b says that no one is poorer than a dog or richer than a pig; this is because no one gives food to a dog, but pigs are fattened for slaughter.

All of this shows that criticism of people by comparing them to dogs and pigs is rather common in the context of 2 Peter. However, the specific ways they are criticized in 2 Peter are not common. The author of 2 Peter did not originate his comparison, but derived it from a proverb. Nevertheless, it is an unusual use of the comparison that suited the purposes of 2 Peter very well.

In 2,18-22 the author of 2 Peter warns the addressees against following the false teachers by returning to the defilements of the world after having been saved from them (v. 20). The behavior of the dog and pig mentioned in v. 22 is a very good analog to such backsliding. Having expelled something harmful from his body, the dog returns to it; having been washed clean, the sow makes herself dirty again. The washing may refer to baptism (cf. also 1,9)<sup>(40)</sup>.

\*  
\* \*

As we have seen, comparison of humans to animals is very common in the ancient world. This comparison can be neutral, simple observation of ways that humans and animals are alike. It can also be positive, a way of praising humans as superior to animals, or for possessing the good qualities of animals. Comparison of humans with animals can also be negative, a way of criticizing humans for possessing the bad qualities of animals or for lacking good qualities that animals have. 2 Peter's comparison of humans with animals is of this last kind. In 2 Peter 2,12 and 22 the author criticizes humans for possessing bad qualities of animals; in 2 Peter 2,16 the author implicitly criticizes humans for lacking the good qualities of Balaam's donkey.

Although 2 Peter's comparison of humans to animals is generally similar to comparisons made by others, we have also seen that the specific way 2 Peter compares them is unique. No other author compares humans to irrational animals in that both are destined for capture and corruption, as 2 Peter does in 2,12. No other author has used the story of Balaam or the proverb about the dog from Prov 26,11 to characterize humans negatively as 2 Peter does in 2,16 and 22. And finally, no other author has used the proverb

<sup>(39)</sup> The first element of this exhortation is quoted in *Didache* 9.5 and applied explicitly to the Eucharist. A parallel to this first element is found in Bekh 15a; Tem 130b. Commenting on Deut 12,15 it says that one should not release holy (food) in order to let the dogs eat it.

<sup>(40)</sup> W. GRUNDMANN, *Der Brief des Judas und der Zweite Brief des Petrus* (THKNT 15; Berlin 1974) 101.

from *The Story of Ahikar* 8.15/18 to describe humans' return to circumstances from which they have been rescued as 2 Peter does in 2,22.

Such negative comparison of humans to animals can be rather dangerous. Richard Sorabji has shown in detail how the idea that animals are irrational supported the conclusion that humans could make any use of animals they chose<sup>(41)</sup>. Comparing humans to animals might support a similar conclusion about those humans. The author of 2 Peter is certainly not drawing such conclusions himself, and his comparison of humans to animals is nuanced and complex. However, his comparison of his opponents to animals could provide the foundation for such a conclusion by others<sup>(42)</sup>.

The Athenaeum of Ohio  
6616 Beechmont Avenue  
Cincinnati, OH 45230

Terrance CALLAN

#### SUMMARY

A striking feature of 2 Peter 2,10b-22 is the author's multiple references to similarities and differences between humans and animals. This essay illuminates this aspect of 2 Peter 2,10b-22 by investigating comparison of humans to animals by writers older than, and (roughly) contemporary with, 2 Peter. Comparison of humans to animals is very common in the ancient world. Such comparison can be neutral, positive, or negative. 2 Peter's comparison of humans with animals is of this last kind. Although 2 Peter's negative comparison of humans to animals is generally similar to comparisons made by others, the specific ways 2 Peter compares them are unique.

<sup>(41)</sup> SORABJI, *Animal Minds*, 107-219.

<sup>(42)</sup> This essay is scheduled to be published in R.L. WEBB – D.F. WATSON (eds.), *Reading Second Peter with New Eyes* (Library of New Testament Studies; London). Such a reading of 2 Peter can be seen in Robert Paul Seesengood's paper, "'Irrational Animals, Creatures of Instinct, Bred to Be Caught and Killed': Hybridity, Alterity and Name-Calling in 2 Peter 2", presented at the 2007 annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature.

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

Meik GERHARDS, *Die Aussetzungsgeschichte des Mose*. Literar- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu einem Schlüsseltext des nichtpriesterschriftlichen Tetrateuch (WMANT 109), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 2006. x-294 p. 15 × 22,5. €44.90

Meik Gerhards's study of the birth and exposure story of Moses (Exod 1,8–2,10) delivers far more than its title may suggest. Unlike other studies of the Moses birth story, this study combines source criticism with analysis of the myth embodied in the biblical text. What is more, the historical-critical approach taken by Gerhards reflects some of the most recent thinking on documentary sources. While its full argument appears only in the final chapter, *Die Aussetzungsgeschichte des Mose* offers numerous insights on particular passages and a far-reaching account of the history, theology, and canonical shape of a key text of the Tetrateuch.

The study divides into four chapters. The first concerns textual analysis and literary criticism of the birth and exposure story; the second seeks to interpret the story within the Bible; the third considers the birth and exposure story as a reception of its counterpart in the Sargon legend; and the fourth, final chapter explores the story as an exilic story of hope.

In the first chapter, Gerhards surveys recent debates on literary and textual criticism and relates them directly to the problem of interpreting the first two chapters of Exodus. His survey ranges from Martin Noth's classic formulation of tradition history, according to which the major themes of the Pentateuch were taken up by the J and E sources before the emergence of historical writing proper. Against this model Gerhards notes the emergence of work by Rolf Rendtorff, Erhard Blum, Hans-Christoph Schmitt, Konrad Schmid, and others (though surprisingly not Thomas Dozeman), who offer alternative accounts of how early layers of biblical tradition find their way into the Pentateuch. Common to most of these new approaches is skepticism about the nature and history of J and E, as well as greater emphasis on Priestly and Deuteronomistic redactions closer to the exilic and post-exilic periods. A related interest is the relationship of the Pentateuch to what some call the Primary History, ranging from Genesis through Second Kings.

Gerhards concludes his survey of current Pentateuch criticism with two questions: the first, the "model question", asks whether the particular themes of the Pentateuch can be explained better by different stages of sources or by an account of literary history. The stakes of this question become clear with the

specific debate on how the earliest Genesis traditions were related to the earliest Moses traditions. The second question Gerhards poses here is the date question of when the ancient history emerged. To address these questions and in the context of the complex debates of Pentateuch criticism, Gerhards offers his study, which builds on an unusual area of scholarly consensus: the view that P unites traditions from the creation to Sinai. Gerhards identifies the main text of his study, Exod 1,8–2,10, as one of two non-priestly bridge texts in this section of the Pentateuch. The birth and exposure of Moses (and the story of Pharaoh and the midwives leading up to it), the focus of this study, thus becomes an opportunity to explore text-historical debates of Pentateuch scholarship.

In his second chapter Gerhards establishes, through text-critical, thematic, and linguistic analysis, the boundaries and literary unity of Exod 1,8–2,10. Among the well-summarized pieces of evidence is the irony that Moses is rescued from the Nile by a member of the same royal family that consigned Hebrew boys to be drowned in the Nile. In addition to establishing the unity of the main pericope, Gerhards addresses the shape and possible layers of 1,1–7. Although the tendency here, as elsewhere, is to slice the text too thinly into different layers, the lengthy discussion of the texts, such as the links between the midwives episode and Genesis 20 and 22, between stories of new generations (Exod 1,8 and Judg 2,10), or between three stories of foreign kings threatened by Israel's strength (Exod 1, Gen 26, and Num 22), makes the analysis worthwhile.

The second chapter then addresses how the early Moses biography fits into the narrative of Exodus and the Bible. Noting the theological and literary transition from Genesis to Exodus, Gerhards briefly considers several approaches to the internal meaning of Exod 1,8–2,10: Moses' birth narrative is compared to those of Samson and Samuel; Moses and Pharaoh are depicted as parallel antagonists; the whole narrative is cast as a tradition held in memory during the monarchy (though surprisingly without reference to the work of Jan Assmann or Jonathan Cohen), and finally, Gerhards shows how the name Moses may indicate his role as a kind of savior. Each of these approaches is interesting and worth developing further. If other chapters depend too much on efforts to establish the diachronic structure of the text, dividing it into thinly-sliced sources, this chapter points promisingly to more synchronic approaches of the sort practiced in literary and cultural approaches to the Bible.

The third chapter offers a thorough review of the Sargon legend and its reception in the Moses text. Taking up Eckart Otto's thesis that the biblical text subverts the Sargon legend, Gerhards moves from a very detailed study of the history and text of the ancient Akkadian legend of Sargon to a methodologically-rich account of how it may have found its way into biblical tradition. The exhaustive review of relevant literature considers oral transmission, textual transmission, comparative mythology, and the possibility of an Egyptian source, showing how the exposure narratives of Moses and Sargon are both members of a larger set of narrative traditions. At the same time, Gerhards maintains the possibility of a close and immediate relationship between the Sargon legend and the biblical text, noting that the latter's departure from the former can be explained theologically.

The disparate parts of Gerhards's study come together in the final chapter, which considers the Moses text as an exilic narrative of hope. The analysis of

Moses' name as "redeemer" from chapter two and the analysis of the Sargon motif as an ideological rejection of standard models of monarchy (chapter 3) are joined with readings of Hosea, 2 Isaiah, and other biblical texts to show how Moses and the story of Exodus become *topoi* for biblical theology. Moses thus becomes a kingly anti-king, a model for future prophets, and most of all, a figure of hope for restoration during the exile. Here, as in chapter 2, Gerhards shows sensitivity to a holistic reading of the text in canonical and literary context.

In the brief summary and conclusion, Gerhards returns to the two questions he poses at the outset: the model of Pentateuch sources and the date of these sources. Given that the Moses narrative is non-priestly but seems to presuppose Priestly elements, Gerhards concludes that there are three sources at work here: E, P, and a third, later source, which he decides to call J. This is not the J of previous models, but a text from the first half of the exilic period. While Gerhards admits this model is only an initial effort to resolve current debates in Pentateuch criticism, he is right that it is bold and interesting. A complete evaluation of this model exceeds the boundaries of this review, but one observation deserves mention. While Gerhards makes a convincing case for the fact that his J is later than the materials of Genesis and Exodus it bridges, his argument nevertheless depends on the stability and discreteness of these materials as documentary sources. As he knows, both E and P have come under increasing scrutiny in recent years with respect to whether they can be conceived traditionally as documentary sources from a single period. One might be tempted to see in Gerhards's analysis an affinity rather with the recent work of Richard Elliott Friedman, John Van Seters, and others, which tends toward a much more holistic approach to the Primary History, one that sees more evidence of a late editorial hand (sharing qualities of the traditional J and D) than of definitive early documents.

Like a good dissertation, Gerhards's study is cautious and prone to long summaries of previous scholarship. But by its impressive erudition and scope, the book demonstrates the necessity and challenges of trying to integrate historical-critical and more canonical, literary approaches to Pentateuch studies. Gerhards engages historical-critical debates with particular energy, but there is a fundamental tension between this approach and the more holistic approaches (canonical, literary, and cultural) one finds in Childs, Cohen, or Assmann, not to mention some of the traditional source critics he cites. Even among his historical-critical interlocutors, notably Rendtorff, there is a growing skepticism about the kind of fine-tuning Gerhards sometimes seeks to accomplish in analysis of the documentary sources. Despite the elusiveness of such analysis, many of the finest and most sensitive readings and textual observations appear in the course of Gerhards's search for documentary and redactional layers. Though *Die Aussetzungsgeschichte des Mose* does not synthesize these disparate methods or resolve the ongoing debates about their interrelationship, it serves as a fine example of both methodologies and a promising piece of work from a versatile scholar.

Religious Studies Program  
Virginia Tech  
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0135

Brian BRITT



Brad E. KELLE, *Hosea 2. Metaphor and Rhetoric in Historical Perspective* (Academia Biblica 20), Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. xiv-355 p. 15 × 23. \$45.95.

This is a revised version of a doctoral dissertation completed at Emory University under the supervision of Martin Buss and Gail O'Day. In it the author develops a novel interpretation of Hosea 2, informed by rhetorical-criticism, metaphor theory and historical data. He contends, contrary to all previous scholars, that Hosea 2 has nothing to do with Baal-worship, the marriage metaphor between God and Israel, or cultic apostasy. Instead, it is an address to a coalition of dissident Samaritans and Judeans urging them to overthrow the anti-Assyrian Pekah and replace him with the pro-Assyrian Hoshea in the wake of the Syro-Ephraimite crisis. Kelle argues his case thoroughly, skillfully and with sophistication, as one might expect from an Emory thesis. However, the radically counter-intuitive reading of the text and the exceedingly narrow focus of the interpretation raise important methodological questions, and ensure that not all will be convinced.

After the usual preliminary survey of scholarship, Kelle turns in his second chapter to issues of rhetoric and metaphor. He rejects the synchronic and stylistic emphasis of rhetorical criticism, as practiced by Muilenburg, Tribble and their followers, in favour of an examination of the persuasive effect of prophecy as oral proclamation in a particular historical context. Prophets delivered their discourses to real audiences for definitive ends. Attention is drawn to the strategies wherewith the orator attempts to influence the audience, including figures of speech, such as metaphor.

In his discussion of metaphor, Kelle draws on the interanimation theory of Black and the conceptual approach of Lakoff and Johnson, according to which metaphor is a primary mode of thinking whereby a society's cultural system is structured. Understanding a metaphor requires knowledge of its culturally determined meanings, and the filtering out of irrelevant ones. At the same time, the creative use of metaphor may restructure experience: "th(e) oracle comes from a rhetorical situation in which the Israelites' basic construction of reality was being reordered due to shifting sociopolitical circumstances" (43).

The next three chapters (chs. 3-5) are devoted to a study of the primary metaphors of Hos 2. The first concerns marriage and divorce in the ancient Near East and especially Elephantine, and argues that the imagery of stripping the divorced woman has nothing to do with ritual humiliation, but is in fact a formula for the husband's disclaiming all responsibility for his wife's maintenance. The second discusses the female imagery in the chapter, and follows John Schmitt's insistence that female personifications in the Hebrew Bible refer exclusively to cities, principally capital cities, and that Israel is always masculine. Thus, contrary to all major commentaries, Kelle holds that the wayward wife in the chapter is Samaria, not Israel. Furthermore, female imagery is usually associated with threats of destruction or actual desolation. The sexual violence of Hos 2 is thus a metaphor for the destruction of the city; the combination of female imagery for cities with regulations for marriage and divorce constitutes the creative innovation of the chapter. Next,

he examines imagery of adultery and fomication, and suggests that they may have a political rather than cultic significance. In the third of these chapters, Kelle examines images of “love” in the Hebrew Bible as well as in the ancient Near East and finds that it frequently is a political rather than amorous term. He concurs with many recent critics that there is no evidence for ritual prostitution or fertility rites in ancient Israel (or indeed in the ancient Near East generally), and suggests that Baal worship was not a serious issue in 8<sup>th</sup> century Israel, adducing the paucity of names with Baal as a theophoric element, the absence of polemic against Baal in other 8<sup>th</sup> century prophets, and the lack of epigraphic evidence. Like the lovers in the Hos 2, the Ba'alim are political allies or masters. The rhetorical achievement of Hos 2 is to make political defection the contemporary equivalent of past religious apostasy.

The sixth chapter defends the unity of Hos 2, again against the consensus of critics, who generally regard vv. 1-3 as a later supplement or as the conclusion of ch.1, and reconstructs its historical context. Kelle situates Hos 2 during the Syro-Ephraimite war, because of his contention that the subject is the capital city and that the imagery of adultery and Baal worship refers to political infidelity. His account of the conflict is complex and carefully documented; however, its salient point is that while Damascus was conquered and annexed by Assyria, its ally, Pekah, in Samaria was overthrown by a coalition of Samaritans and Judeans under the pro-Assyrian Hoshea. This is a novel and speculative thesis, which is based largely on inference from, for instance, the silence of Assyrian sources about Judah. Consequently, he rejects the biblical account, whereby Ahaz appealed to Assyria against the Syro-Ephraimite compact. Vv. 1-3, then, is not an eschatological vision of the ultimate unification of Judah and Israel, as is usually supposed, but a direct appeal to the confederates to act against Pekah.

The last two chapters before a summary conclusion consist of a translation and a commentary, in which Kelle provides detailed reinterpretations of the text to support his thesis and to substantiate its rhetorical effect. In general, the comments are unsurprising, given his approach; occasionally, however, he introduces highly original lexical suggestions. For instance, he spends several pages (247-255) arguing that לכסות ערותה, “to cover her nakedness” in 2,11 should actually be translated “to reckon her indiscretion,” reading לכסות as an anomalous infinitive of the uncommon root כסס. It is nowhere made clear, however, why the straightforward meaning of the phrase should be rejected, especially since it would accord well with his general interpretation.

Kelle has undoubtedly produced an incisive, well-argued monograph. For that reason, there are important methodological as well as historical and exegetical issues to be discussed, if the traditional interpretation is to be abandoned. The fundamental question, in my view, concerns the nature of this text and the appropriateness of the rhetorical-historical approach to it. All we have in Hos 2 is a poetic text. We do not know whether it was originally oral or written; once written, it was presumably designed to be read and reread. In the case of classical political orators, to which Kelle (32) suggests the prophets are analogous, matters are entirely different. We know the occasions on which orations were delivered, their formal conventions, and the point the orator wished to convey. Speeches are long, so that the argument

has time to be developed. Hos 2, in contrast, is short and complex. The suasive effect of a speech three or four minutes long, in an allegorical code which is not rendered explicit and which has been invisible to all commentators until now, is difficult to substantiate. Indeed, it is noticeable that in his commentary Kelle spends much time trying to fit the text to his interpretation, but rather little on its rhetorical import.

Poetry is characteristically dense, polysemous, and of universal significance, especially poetry of the scope, ethical seriousness, historical urgency and divine authority of the prophets. Kelle reverses the usual way of reading poetry; instead of being about the entire history of Israel, for him Hos 2 is a local political intervention. This results in a univocal, not to say thin, interpretation. It is like looking through the wrong end of a telescope. The implied poetics has consequences for Kelle's treatment of metaphor. Whereas in his chapter on theory, Kelle admirably summarises contemporary approaches to metaphor, in practice he resorts to a simple substitutionary model: the lovers are foreign nations, as are the Ba'alim. It is thus reductive, in that the metaphors are ciphers for existent political entities.

One wonders then about the survival of the text. What relevance does it have beyond the exigencies of the particular moment of its creation? If, as Ehud Ben Zvi argues in his recent commentary (*Hosea* [FOTL 21A/1; Grand Rapids, MI 2006]), prophetic texts were written to be read and reread, what would subsequent generations make of it? Is all reading a misprision?

Kelle's argument turns on two propositions, both of which I find questionable. The first is that the marriage metaphor refers exclusively to the relationship of YHWH and Samaria, not YHWH and Israel. Kelle relies, as I have noted, on Schmitt's conviction that female personifications in the HB are cities, and that Israel is always masculine. Schmitt, however, is wrong. It is true that cities are grammatically feminine and countries masculine, and that poets, like all humans, are constrained by the rules of language, but there are several techniques for circumventing them, all of them used by Hebrew poets. The first, perhaps the most obvious, is the use of a feminine synonym, especially *הָאָרֶץ*, "the land." As Kelle (84) notes, the identification of the subject with Israel is founded on the image of the land's fornication against YHWH in 1,2. A preliminary step for him is then the undefended and indefensible separation of chs. 1 and 2, which erodes in the course of the book. However, the image of the land keeps on returning in 2,20-25, and cannot be other than the primary subject. Secondly, there is the use of agricultural imagery, whereas if the subject were Samaria one would expect the referents to be urban. Thirdly, the Hebrew poets could use female similes for masculine subjects, as when Ephraim is described as a "silly dove" in 8,11. Fourthly, and very commonly, a city may be a metonym for a country. For instance, when in Jer 2,2 Jerusalem is remembered for its primordial romance with YHWH in the wilderness, the subject must be Israel not Jerusalem, since cities are not mobile. Likewise, in Hos 2,16-17 the recollection of the Exodus can only refer to Israel, not Samaria. Finally, the poet could resort to simple amnesia. In Jer 2, for example, changes of gender imply no change of subject.

The second questionable proposition is that Baal worship was not prevalent in 8<sup>th</sup> century Israel. Certainly according to the Deuteronomistic History it was, since Manasseh worshipped Baal (2 Kings 22,2) and it was an

aspect of the apostasy of Northern Israel (2 Kings 17,16). However much credence we should place on this, it is part of the DH's image of the past or present, and *prima facie* refers to something existent. Different prophets have different agendas; polemics against Baal are characteristic of Hosea and Jeremiah, but not, as Kelle says, of Amos, Isaiah or Micah. This does not mean that there was no cult of Baal, but merely that it was not of interest to the other prophets. Amos, for instance, is not at all concerned with other gods of any kind. Correspondingly, only Hosea inveighs against golden calves.

Kelle has produced an interesting, challenging and brave book. I do not think that he has succeeded, for the reasons I have outlined, but by questioning the established consensus he has contributed to the critical process whereby scholarship advances.

Dept. of History and Classics  
2-28 Henry Marshall Tory Building,  
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2H4

Francis LANDY

Maria Carmela PALMISANO, "Salvaci, *Dio dell'Universo!*". Studio dell'euchologia di Sir 36H,1-17 (AnBib 163). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006. 468 pp. 16,5 × 24.

This book is the published form of a doctoral dissertation, which was written under the direction of Maurice Gilbert, S.J., and defended at the Pontifical Biblical Institute on 17 March 2006. As typical of such a genre, this (overly) detailed work includes hundreds of footnotes and references to scholars who have in any way studied the short euchology, or prayer, in Sir 36H,1-17. The book has three parts, divided into seven chapters.

Chapter 1, "Status Quaestionis regarding Sir 36H,1-17", gives the Hebrew text according to the edition of P.C. Beentjes with his numbering of the verses (*The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* [VTS 68; Leiden - New York - Cologne 1997]); then the text and numbering found in *The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary* (Jerusalem 1973); and finally, the text and numbering found in M.Z. Segal, ספר בן־סירא השלם (Jerusalem 1997). The text of Beentjes alone would have sufficed. The Greek text and numbering come next, according to the critical edition of J. Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Septuaginta 12/2; Göttingen 1980); then the text and numbering of the (less than critical) edition of A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart 1935, 1979), which has now been published in a second, corrected edition by R. Hanhart (Stuttgart 2006). Again, I do not see the point of printing the text of Rahlfs. The Syriac text (in a beautiful estrangela font) and numbering come from Codex Ambrosianus (photofacsimile, Milan 1883), with the numbering in parentheses of the edition of N. Calduch-Benages, J. Ferrer, and J. Liesen, *La Sabiduría del Escriba: Edición diplomática de la versión siríaca del libro de Ben Sira según el Códice Ambrosiano, con traducción española e inglesa/ Wisdom of*

*the Scribe: Diplomatic Edition of the Syriac Version of the Book of Ben Sira according to Codex Ambrosianus, with Translations in Spanish and English* [Bibliotheca Midrásica 26; Estella (Navarra) 2003]); and the Latin text and numbering from the Rome Vulgate (12; Rome 1964).

She discusses in detail the authenticity of the prayer, first considering those who argue against authenticity (e.g., T. Middendorp, L. Schrader, and J.J. Collins) and then refuting, fairly, their arguments. She agrees with the scholars who argue for Ben Sira's paternity (e.g., J. Marböck, B.G. Wright, and M. Zapella). She then discusses the delimitation of the prayer and its literary context, pointing out scholars who separate the prayer from what precedes it as well as authors who connect the prayer with the preceding text. In the next section, "the context of reference" (*il contesto di riferimento*), she spells out various hypotheses: liturgical context, didactic context, historical-social context. The literary genre of the prayer she considers to be a particular form of lament/supplication.

Chapter 2, "The cry that goes up to the clouds: The context of the prayer in Sir 36H,1-17/33G, 1-13a; 36,16b-22", is somewhat difficult to follow primarily because of the different numbers used in the Hebrew text and in the Greek text. It would have benefited the reader if she had followed a uniform, or consistent, system of numbering—a system, for example, that I argued for in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York 1987) x. First, she describes the views of various commentators regarding the literary genre of 31G,21–32G,26. Next she explains the dynamic of the argument of this text, with its various components, including the definitive response of God (in 35H,14–26) who hears the cry of the poor and weak, who are victims of injustice, and re-establishes justice in society.

In chapter 3, Palmisano discusses (once again in great detail) Sir 36H,1-5, the first strophe of the prayer, giving the textual criticism, her reconstruction of the text of Cairo Geniza MS B, the literary analysis and structure, and finally the exegesis of the strophe, which she describes as the beginning of the cry for help. Ben Sira, she rightly concludes, liberally borrowed from the preceding biblical tradition, and related the past historical and prophetic moments to the sufferings of the people of his day. The sage thereby makes present the riches of salvation that God can offer again in contemporary society. Chapter 4 examines Sir 36H,6-10/33G,6-12, the second strophe of the prayer. After discussing the textual problems and the literary and structural analysis, Palmisano provides a thorough exegesis that takes into account the various punishments the sage asks the Lord to bring down upon Israel's enemies. She also points out several lexicographic similarities that selected texts from Qumran share with this strophe. She isolates from Ben Sira's prayer specific verbs and nouns that recur in the Qumran texts and then discusses them briefly.

Palmisano devotes chapter 5 to Sir 36H,11-14/33G,13a; 36,16b-19 (13-16), the third strophe of the prayer. She follows the same procedures she employed in the study of the other strophes: textual criticism, literary and structural analysis, and exegesis. In the exegesis, which gets the lion's share of space, she explains the first requests for the people in 36H,11/33G,13a; 36,16b (13). Here she notes, as she did in the previous strophe, similar vocabulary that is found in the Qumran literature. Then she supplies parallels

with liturgical texts, especially the *וְיִתְחַנֵּן*, a prayer that scholars generally agree was structured on an old nucleus from the Second Temple period (246, n. 49). Next she discusses 36H,12-13/36G,17-18 (14-15) which contain the requests for God to show compassion on Israel and Jerusalem. In 36H,12/36G,17 (14), she explains the implications of how God is depicted as father of Israel; 36H,13/36G,18 (15) deals with God's tender feeling for Jerusalem, his holy city. Finally, she supplies an ample exegesis of 36H,14/36G,19 (16), which calls upon God to fill Jerusalem and the temple with his glory.

Chapter 6 studies 36H,15-17/36G,20-22 (17-19), the prayer's fourth strophe that calls upon God to fulfill the prophecies of old. Again here, after the usual presentation of the textual criticism and literary and structural analysis, Palmisano gives a thorough exegesis of the various verses. She concludes the chapter by observing that this strophe recapitulates the major points in the rest of the prayer. She also calls attention to the intertextual connections with other OT prayers, particularly from the Deuteronomistic History.

In the seventh and final chapter, entitled "The wise man Ben Sira between history and prophecy", Palmisano provides a brief history of Palestine between 200 and 175 B.C. She then discusses the similarities between Sir 36H,1-17/33G,1-13a; 36,16b-22e and 2 Macc 3,1-40. It is very probable, she concludes, that the call for divine help in Sir 36H,1-17 derives from an historical context similar to that described in 2 Maccabees 3. Nonetheless, she states that in addition to the exegetical study of Sir 31G,21-36G,22, the historical investigation supports a pre-Maccabean dating for Ben Sira's prayer.

After a General Conclusion there follows an appendix to chapter 2 that contains related texts in their literary contexts: 31(34)G,21-31; the Syriac of 31,18-26 (34,21-31, in the numbering of the edition of Calduch-Benages, Ferrer, and Liesen, with a translation into Italian; the Latin of 34(31),21-31; then 32G (35),1-13; Hebrew of 35,11-13; Syriac of 32 (35),1-10 (12), with a translation; and Latin of 35(32),1-13; and finally, 35H,14-26; 32G (35),14-26, with a translation; Syriac 32,12-20 (35,14-26), with a translation; and Latin 35(31),14-26. The appendix to chapter 3 shows the distribution of the roots *כבד* and *קדש* and their derivatives in the Book of Ben Sira.

Excursus I analyzes, first, the recurrence of the pattern "crying out" and "response" in Ben Sira, and second, the "response of God" in the instructions of the wise. Excursus II provides a useful chart of the various words for "the poor" in Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, and Latin. Then follow two tables, giving rather good color facsimiles of Cairo Geniza MS B, folio T-S 16.313, recto and verso, containing the Hebrew text that Palmisano has studied in her work. Following an extensive Bibliography (371-411), there are three indexes: authors, cited texts, and general (what we would call a table of contents).

In sum, Palmisano has done an enormous amount of research for this monograph, and she seems to have included practically everything she read on Ben Sira's relatively short prayer. A minor criticism I have is that, in my opinion, her study could have been made more cogent and perhaps clearer as well as easier to read if she had exercised more judgment in dealing with, and then omitting, relatively minor matters.

Timothy D. FINLAY, *The Birth Report Genre in the Hebrew Bible* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe 12), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2005. xix-292 p. 15,5 × 23. €59

The current work is a revision of the author's doctoral dissertation for Claremont Graduate University in California. As such the writing style is technical and the research detailed. In addition, the writer took care to show awareness of the most current research related to the passages investigated. Finlay not only provides his own interpretation but also leaves notes on numerous additional resources. For the scholar or student beginning study of the birth reports this aspect makes the book an invaluable resource.

Finlay concentrates on the small form-critical units known as "birth reports". He attempts an exhaustive review of these, incorporating concern for the broader literary context in which these units are placed. Typically the birth reports are set within more detailed texts that involve genealogy, or an announcement of birth, or a symbolic use of names. The broader context comprises the framework in which these three (and some miscellaneous birth notice texts) are set. The three types of texts (genealogies, birth announcements, and prophetic symbolic naming events) serve as the basis for the three major chapters of Finlay's work. Finlay found the prophetic naming convention only in Isaiah 8 and Hosea 1–3.

The outline of the book is most straightforward. Chapter 1 (introduction) and chapter 2 define and list all birth reports. Chapter 3 treats birth reports in genealogies. Chapter 4 deals with birth reports in annunciation type-scenes; chapter 5 with birth reports in prophetic symbolic events; and chapter 6 with birth reports in miscellaneous text types that do not fit the three central categories. Finlay responded to "a dearth of scholarship" in regard to birth reports and presented his work as the first "thorough analysis" of the units (1).

There is something of a thesis for the work in the contention that birth reports are modified by the literary context in which they appear. The author devotes special attention to the exploration of the specific ways that biblical editors/authors adapted the birth reports to suit the narrative at hand. Finlay found that "the wording of elements in the specific birth reports contributed significantly to narrative development within larger literary structures" (160). For example, differences in the settings for the birth reports and the birth reports themselves reflect the relative status of Jacob's children (129-30).

Finlay claims a far greater number of birth reports (73 birth reports that present 113 births) existed in the Hebrew Bible than in other known ancient Near Eastern literature. This suggests a heightened sense of the importance of child bearing in Israel and indicates the relatively higher status of the wife in Hebrew society. This pronounced interest in propagation and birth also helps account for the repeated attention to the devastation of childlessness in Hebrew narratives (42).

Narrative accounts of birth exhibit great differences from the oral birth announcements they may originate in. Behind the current biblical text existed life settings in which statements regarding the status and destiny of the child or the family were made in the form of pronouncements. In the biblical story

the births carry significance for the narratives in which they are set. So, they are distinctly “literary” in nature (42).

Finlay defines an even smaller form-critical unit than the birth report. He distinguishes “birth notices” from the longer birth reports. A birth notice consists of “a simple unit that narrates one fact and which uses at most one finite verb”. For example, “Hannah bore Samuel”. The birth notices are confined to genealogical passages. Finlay suggested that birth notices were formed based on a societal convention that included conception, birth, naming and etiology. The mere “Hannah bore Samuel” format served as an abbreviation of the convention explicitly for use in genealogical lists (244). When a longer birth report is included in a genealogical passage, it is typically introduced by an explanation for its inclusion, for example when children are born to a concubine in addition to a principal wife (245). The more elaborate birth reports typically involve mentions of conception, birth, naming and etiology. Finlay denotes three levels from the most simple to the most complex — birth notice, birth report and birth account (14).

Finlay depended upon Robert Alter’s notion of “type-scene”, particularly the “annunciation type-scene”, to designate the extended birth accounts in the narrative portions of the Hebrew Bible. Alter used “type-scene” to term the recurring sorts of stories that seem near duplicates to the contemporary reader (Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* [New York 1981] 47-62). Alter gave privilege to contemporary literary sensibility. This he added to the form critical concern for biblical and pre biblical social settings. In part, Alter attempted to account for the contemporary reader’s perspective. Finlay assumes the outlines of such an approach but without much attention to the reader’s perspective. Recognizing the similar outlines of birth announcements, Finlay aptly gave attention to the subtle alterations and omissions by which the biblical narratives provide clues to the distinct message of the immediate story and the larger story in which it occurs. It comes as no surprise that the special wording of birth reports is used to emphasize the special destiny of a chosen child while underscoring the secondary nature of a child who, like Ishmael, stands on the margins of the biblical story.

With respect to the annunciation type-scene in general, its three aspects: “depiction of the plight of a barren woman”, “annunciation scene proper” and “birth report” (87) actually yield five component parts: “depiction of childlessness, prayer, annunciation scene proper, birth report and concluding statement” (245, 159).

Finlay complemented his form-critical starting point with narrative criticism and included limited attention to feminist criticism in his narrative approach. He noted that only 4 of the 113 children mentioned in birth reports are identified as females. Yet the naming of children belongs to women in ancient Hebrew society: “The narrator empowers the female character to proclaim the significance of the child’s birth” (248). So, Finlay concluded, “birth reports represent an intrusion, however slight, of feminine presence into a masculine domain” (249). Such a finding could be strengthened by the identification of a social convention that designates the mother as responsible for the name of the child. Finlay proposes this (29) but without suggestions for its implications for a feminist reading of biblical narrative. More



thoroughgoing ideological critics would certainly hope for stronger expressions of gender based facets — for example, the recognition that the deity helps the woman whose husband cannot provide her with a child. Yahweh thus performs the neglected duty of the father.

The texts offer other opportunities for stronger ideological readings. In the narrative relating the story of David and Bathsheba Finlay finds warrant for Bathsheba's willing cooperation in adultery (223, 225). Larger societal influences, notably the authority and subsequent accountability of the kingship could be discussed in this connection. There is also the nature of the story itself, the fact that it neither directly excuses nor directly implicates Bathsheba. Finlay appropriately maintained focus on his interests in birth narratives and their precise wording. I find no weakness here but especially with respect to feminist criticism, the texts offer many more lessons in both repression and liberation than the current work can account for.

His interpretations sometimes overlook broader contextual and historical issues that are pertinent to his claims. For example, in discussing the birth of Samson (137-138), he omits treatment of the general characterization of Samson as scandalous hero which certainly affected the content of the birth notice. Finlay does account for the unfavorable depiction of Israel as a whole in the book of Judges but at times seems less than attuned to the storyteller's art. Similarly, in the story of Hannah, no attention is given to the placement of the narrative as the initial story of the kingship. Recognition of this context provides additional insights into the variations in Hannah's birth notice. These limitations are surely based on the particular focus of Finlay's research. Finlay cannot possibly offer an exhaustive interpretation of each passage. His limited interpretive comments add a good deal of interest to the volume. Many additional intensive readings of the texts remain. Approaching the texts from the distinctive perspective of the birth report offers new possibilities for close readings.

One of the strongest features of the work is a concise concluding chapter that reiterates the major findings in summary fashion. In it the author presents a well-condensed summary of general and specific findings. The strength of this research is in its clear arrangement. Terms are simply defined — without excessive technical jargon or complication. The systematic presentation of the material makes it as accessible as possible. *The Birth Report Genre in the Hebrew Bible* will serve both students and scholars well.

University of Mobile  
5735 College Parkway  
Mobile, AL 36613

Donald K. BERRY

### Novum Testamentum

Richard BAUCKHAM, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*. The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony, Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006. xiii-538 p. 16 × 24. \$32.00 £18.99

This book seeks to demonstrate that the canonical Gospels are much closer, in form and content, to the testimony of the original eyewitnesses than is commonly assumed in current scholarship. Building upon the prior work of the Swedish scholar Samuel Byrskog (*Story as History - History as Story. The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* [Tübingen 2000]), Bauckham assembles evidence in support of his claim that the Gospel of Mark renders in literary form the oral testimony of Peter and that the Gospel of John was composed by one of Jesus' followers, whose status as an eyewitness authorized him to construct a recognizably "historical" account of Jesus' life in the form of an artfully arranged narrative with a full reflection on the significance of the witnessed events. In view of such references linking the Gospels with the testimony of eyewitnesses, Bauckham argues in favor of a decidedly unfashionable conception of the gospel tradition, in which the original eyewitnesses, contrary to the hypothesis of R. Bultmann and other early form critics, continued to play an important role up to the time the canonical Gospels were written.

After an introductory chapter, the presentation begins in chap. 2 with an analysis of a quotation from Papias's "Exposition of the Logia of the Lord", preserved by Eusebius of Caesarea (*Hist. Eccl.* 3.39.3-4). While accepting the traditional dating of Papias's work in the early second century, Bauckham argues that the quotation refers to an earlier time (ca. 80-90 C.E.) when Papias first began to collect reports about Jesus from named sources. In accordance with the value ancient historians attached to autopsy, Papias's expressed preference for "a living and surviving voice" refers not to oral tradition per se but to first-hand information received from eyewitnesses. This external evidence is viewed as proof that at the time the Gospels were written traditions about Jesus were explicitly linked with named eyewitnesses who continued to be sources and guarantors of the stories they told. In the chapters that follow, Bauckham presents evidence from the Synoptic Gospels that indicates such reliance upon the testimony of eyewitnesses. The unusual identification of minor characters in discrete episodes, especially in Mark, reveals the eyewitness sources for those stories (chap. 3), while the range of personal names that occur correlates well with onomastic evidence from first-century Palestine (chap. 4). In the recorded lists of the names of the Twelve Bauckham finds reason to affirm the thesis of B. Gerhardson (*The Reliability of the Gospel Tradition* [Peabody 2001]) that the Twelve constituted an official body of eyewitnesses who exercised controlling authority in formulating and transmitting the main corpus of gospel tradition (chap. 5). Bauckham then gives particular attention in chapters 6 and 7 to the various ways in which the author of Mark indicates his special reliance on Peter's testimony: the

appearance of Peter at the beginning and end of the narrative identifies him as the authoritative eyewitness able to vouch for the overall shape of the story; the clustered use of a peculiarly Marcan narrative technique in proximity to the prominent references to Peter makes the dominant perspective of the narrative that of Peter; and the literary characterization of Peter as the leading representative of a larger group of disciples confirms the author's reliance on the traditions Peter related as part of his apostolic preaching. For the Passion Narrative, however, the author indicates his dependence on those mysteriously unnamed participants (e.g., the woman who anoints Jesus in Mark 14,3-9), whose identities were purposefully concealed in the initial retelling of the story in order to protect them from the hostile authorities (chap. 8). Bauckham concludes that this internal evidence from the Gospels justifies a more positive view of a further quotation from Papias, also preserved by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 3.39.14-16), which explicitly affirms that the Gospels of Mark and Matthew were directly based on the eyewitness testimony of Peter and the other apostles (chap. 9).

In the next three chapters (10-12), Bauckham considers the wider implications of putting the original eyewitnesses back into the process of transmitting the gospel tradition. The results of recent research are used to refute the still prevailing legacy of the founders of Form Criticism, who erected a concept of tradition history on the analogy of "folk literature" as an anonymous transmission of oral traditions that were freely adapted to address the needs of the community. Bauckham argues that this model of tradition history is based on a number of dubious assumptions: the romantic notion of a "folk" as the collective creator of tradition; the gradual devolution from "pure forms"; the consistent operation of certain "laws of tradition"; the perfect correspondence between a tradition and its use (homeostasis); the linear development of the tradition from a Jewish Palestinian to a Hellenistic setting; and a literary notion of how traditions develop through multiple layers of editing. Bauckham finds a fresh starting point in K. Bailey's recent study of oral communication in the villages of the Middle East, in which he distinguishes three types of oral transmission: 1) Informal Uncontrolled Tradition (cf. the model of Form Criticism); 2) Formal Controlled Tradition (cf. the early Rabbinical schools); 3) Informal Controlled Tradition, in which the rehearsal of valued traditions is controlled by the community with a special role reserved for its most competent and reliable members. Whereas Bailey himself and several others have viewed the Informal Controlled Tradition as the best model for understanding the gospel tradition, Bauckham argues in favor of the Formal Controlled Tradition as the only model that leaves room for the active role assumed by the original eyewitnesses. Relying chiefly on evidence from the Pauline Letters (e.g. 1 Cor 11; 15), Bauckham claims to find oblique references not only to an isolated block of traditional material about Jesus but also to a formal process of transmission, in which both the original eyewitnesses in Jerusalem and authorized teachers in various local communities played key roles. This section of the book concludes with an appended chapter (13) that considers the reliability of such eyewitness testimony incorporated into the Gospels. Recent scientific studies, according to Bauckham, have determined that recollective memory has two basic components. On the one hand, the objective reality of the remembered event

serves to constrain the remembering process and so accounts for the relative stability and accuracy of memories, especially when certain factors are in place (e.g., the unusualness of the event, the subject's emotional involvement, and the frequent rehearsal of the memory). On the other hand, recollective memory is also a process of interpretative reconstruction which follows certain "cognitive structures", i.e., mental patterns that allow the mind to organize data in a useful way. Bauckham insists that both of these aspects of memory must be kept in mind when assessing the eyewitness testimony incorporated in the Gospels. The recollected memories of Jesus do, in fact, fulfill the scientific criteria for high reliability, while the formal features that show varying levels of schematization and narrativization reflect the use of cognitive structures within the normal process of remembering and communicating.

In the succeeding section (chaps. 14–17), Bauckham argues that the Fourth Gospel represents the eyewitness testimony of the "Beloved Disciple". In view of the practice of ancient Greek historians who gave preference to the discerning testimony of involved participants, the Fourth Gospel may be seen as the work of a disciple whose first-hand experience authorized him to compose a more fully interpretative account of the events and their significance. While admitting that the language of "testimony" in this Gospel also functions metaphorically within the complex symbolic world of the text, Bauckham denies that a historiographic sense of such terminology is necessarily excluded. The identity of the author as a disciple outside the circle of the Twelve, according to Bauckham, accounts for why his self-disclosed identity as the author (John 20,30-31; 21,24-25) is withheld until after the narrative establishes his credibility as an especially perceptive disciple who enjoyed an exceptional intimacy with Jesus.

In a final chapter (18) Bauckham addresses the relevant concerns of modern believers that extend beyond the purely historical issues covered in the preceding chapters. He argues that "testimony" is the most appropriate category for understanding what kind of history the Gospels represent. Within the inter-subjective process of human knowing, which includes the narrower realm of historiography, the proper and necessary response to the testimony of others, he argues, is neither uncritical acceptance nor radical skepticism but a dialectic of trust and critical assessment. Moreover, the category of testimony allows us to understand how the Gospels present claims that are at once historical and theological. In testifying to what they themselves perceived, the eyewitnesses express their conviction that in the events of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection God's definitive action for human salvation was disclosed. Christian believers, Bauckham maintains, are legitimately interested in the history of Jesus because they, too, acknowledge in faith the disclosure of God's action in that history. The testimony of the Gospels, therefore, is of crucial importance, for it gives us access both to the history of Jesus and to what the first eyewitnesses came to perceive as the redemptive meaning of those exceptional events.

There are certainly many positive features that recommend this study to all students of the Gospels. Bauckham makes a valiant attempt to restore a needed balance in Gospel scholarship by refuting the radical skepticism of those who accept in the Gospels only what can be independently verified. Many will find convincing the further claim that "testimony" offers a valid

and useful category for understanding both the historical and theological dimensions of the texts. More specifically, Bauckham has demonstrated very effectively why the current model of Tradition History, long ago constructed by the early form critics and still prevailing despite its many weaknesses, needs to give way to a new model that leaves room for the testimony of the original eyewitnesses. That new understanding, Bauckham rightly affirms, must incorporate what recent studies have uncovered about the nature of oral communication: e.g., the key role played by individuals in the formation and transmission of tradition; the dynamics of recollective memory in which past events are at once faithfully recorded and interpretatively reconstructed; and the validity of what involved participants report about the exceptional events that they alone have witnessed and understood.

It must be said, however, that many will remain unconvinced by the alternative model of a "Formal Controlled Tradition" that Bauckham proposes in this book. It may be true that the literary features of Mark show a closer connection with the testimony of Peter than is commonly assumed. But the evidence fails to sustain Bauckham's hypothesis of a fixed body of Jesus tradition formulated by the Twelve in Jerusalem and mediated directly to the author of Mark through the apostolic preaching of Peter. Without accepting Bauckham's dubious claim that Peter's appearance at the beginning and end of Mark represents a literary device for identifying the work's authoritative witness, it is very difficult to affirm the other alleged indications of the author's reliance on Peter's testimony, which are ambiguous at best. Equally questionable are the historical conclusions Bauckham draws from Paul's Letters about the formal transmission of Jesus traditions. The level of institutionalization thus ascribed to the Jesus movement in the earliest stages of its development strains credibility. Likewise, Bauckham's hypothesis about the Beloved Disciple as the eyewitness author of the Fourth Gospel will not convince many. Often resting on unproven assumptions, the argument frequently invokes highly conjectural explanations of textual evidence that are not easily affirmed. For example, most will find fanciful the attempt to account for the infrequency and obscurity of references to the Beloved Disciple by appealing to the author's need to establish his credibility as a perceptive disciple before disclosing his identity as the actual author of the Gospel. Even if we were to accept as probable many of the conclusions Bauckham draws from the Gospels, there still remains a larger question that weakens the argument of the book. If it is true that the Evangelists attached such importance to eyewitness testimony, then why are indications of this not more obvious and explicit? In response, Bauckham claims that ancient readers would have expected the Gospels to have eyewitness sources and so would have been alert to the subtle indications provided by the text. This explanation ascribes to the Evangelists and their readers a full measure of literary sophistication and an informed familiarity with the canons of Greco-Roman historiography. But this seems to far exceed what we can claim to know about the first eyewitnesses and those who listened to their testimony.

Martin HENGEL, *Der unterschätzte Petrus. Zwei Studien*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2006. x-261 pp. 11 × 18. €24

Der international renommierte Tübinger evangelische Neutestamentler legt hier zwei Aufsätze zu einem ökumenisch brisanten Thema vor: der Gestalt des Petrus. Der Titel nennt bereits die These: zumindest im protestantischen Bereich wird Petrus bis in die Gegenwart in seiner Bedeutung für die entstehende Kirche oft unterschätzt, nicht zuletzt im kontinentalen Europa. Vor allem der erste der beiden Beiträge behandelt das im Titel genannt Thema: "Petrus, der Fels, Paulus und die Evangelientradition". Es handelt sich hier ursprünglich um einen Vortrag, den der Verf. im November 2005 bei einer gemeinsamen Veranstaltung des Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum und des Melanchthon-Zentrums in Rom hielt. Man könnte sich keinen besseren Ort für eine solche Veranstaltung denken.

Der Gang der ersten Abhandlung kann hier nur kurz skizziert werden. H. beginnt mit "Drei Fragen zu Mt 15,17-19": Von wem stammt die Texteinheit? Wann ist sie entstanden? Warum hat sie der Evangelist als "Sondergut" in sein Werk aufgenommen bzw. sie selbst redigiert? (3) Mit anderen Autoren verlegt H. die Entstehung des Textes in die letzte Dekade des 1. Jahrhunderts. Dabei denkt er sich den fraglichen Abschnitt in einem Milieu entstanden, in dem die Autorität des Petrus betont werden sollte, wohl nicht zuletzt gegenüber der Lehrautorität des Jakobus in Jerusalem. In Frage kommt dabei vor allem das südliche Syrien (7). Im Abschnitt "Das Wort vom 'Felsenmann'" geht H. dessen Entstehung nach. Es verweist nach ihm auf vorösterliche Zeit. Möglicherweise hat sich Paulus bereits in 1 Kor 3,10-15 polemisch damit auseinandergesetzt, als er betonte, dass es kein anderes Fundament gäbe als Christus (etwas spekulativ: 25-27). Paulus selbst scheint nach H. den Petrus-Titel zu vermeiden (37-39). Die Auswirkungen des Felsenwortes begegnen in Mt 16,19. Hier geht es um die "uneingeschränkte Lehr- und Ordnungsgewalt des Angesprochenen", in 18,18 um Disziplin (43). Anschließend behandelt H. Petrus als die "apostolische Grundgestalt der Kirche" in der Zeit vor Matthäus. Die Bedeutung des Petrus sieht H. bereits in vorösterlicher Zeit grundgelegt. Anders als U. Luz sieht er die Bedeutung des Petrus nicht nur in seiner Mittlerrolle, sondern auch in seiner geisterfüllten Christusverkündigung (53-58). Seine Bedeutung wurde offenbar auch von Paulus anerkannt (Gal 1,18; 56). Für die spätere Zeit bezeugen das Markus- und das Matthäusevangelium ebenso wie der 1. Petrusbrief und die zahlreichen Petrusapokryphen die Bedeutung des Petrus (57). Von da aus ergibt sich für H. die Aufforderung an den Protestantismus, die petruskritische Einstellung zu überdenken (57-58).

Ein gewichtiges Argument für die führende Rolle des Petrus in der frühchristlichen Missionsgeschichte findet sich in der Überlieferung, nach der Markus Schüler des Petrus war. Ihm widmet H. seinen folgenden Abschnitt. Das Zeugnis des Papias für Petrus als Schüler und Dolmetscher des Petrus wurde in der Vergangenheit oft heruntergespielt, verdient nach H. jedoch Respekt (58-60). Es scheint sich im Text des Markusevangeliums selbst zu bestätigen. Petrus ist der erste und der letzte der im Markusevangelium genannten Jünger (65). Viele Szenen im Zweiten Evangelium spielen am See Gennesaret (64-65). Auch die römische Herkunft des Markusevangeliums würde für Petrus-tradition sprechen (64).

Einen erheblichen Umfang nimmt der Abschnitt "Die spätere Rolle des Petrus und sein Konflikt mit Paulus" ein (78-129). Das Wirkungsfeld des Petrus reichte bis in den Westen und nach Rom. Theologisch stand Petrus näher bei Paulus als bei Jakobus (84). Petrus war ein überaus erfolgreicher Heidenmissionar (ebd.). Anders als Paulus konnte er umfassend auf Jesustradition zurückgreifen (85). Diese schloss die Öffnung des Heils auch für die Völker ein (85-86). Petrus vertritt nicht die strenge Jerusalemer Gesetzstradition, wie auch die Cornelius-Geschichte zeigt (86-87). Er verkündigte wohl zunächst in der jüdischen Diaspora, traf mit den Juden aber auch auf Heiden als Hörer der Botschaft (90-92). Eben daraus ergibt sich der Konflikt mit Paulus in Antiochien (92). Er fand wohl Jahre nach dem Apostelkonzil ca. 52-53 n. Chr. statt (93). Eine Folge war, dass Paulus Antiochien nicht mehr erwähnte und auch wohl nicht mehr besuchte (103-104). Paulus blieb Jerusalem verbunden, Petrus in seiner Praxis auch der Führung der dortigen judenchristlichen Gemeinde (darum der Verzicht auf gemeinsame Mahlzeiten von Juden- und Heidenchristen). Paradigmatisch geht H. der Frage "Petrus in Korinth" nach (106). 1 Kor 1,11-12 setzt eine Kephaspartei voraus, die man ernst nehmen sollte. Zu der Betonung, dass Christus das einzige Fundament ist (1 Kor 3,10-15), und die H. möglicherweise polemisch versteht, s. o. (und 108). H. sieht in dem Konflikt auch die Betonung des Apostolats des Paulus begründet (109-110). Freilich hält Paulus an der Einheit von Verkündigung und Kirche fest, vgl. 1 Kor 15,11 (111). Der Zweite Korintherbrief spiegelt noch den Konflikt mit Petrus und seiner Richtung wider, vor allem in 2 Kor 10-13, einem Abschnitt, der sich scheinbar mit unspezifizierten Gegnern auseinandersetzt (111-118). Der Römerbrief setzt seinerseits Spannungen voraus, lässt sie aber im Dunkeln. Petrus wird ebenso wenig erwähnt wie die Gründung der römischen Gemeinde (118-120). Das Aposteldekret könnte Ausdruck eines Kompromisses zwischen beiden Richtungen sein (120-121), freilich ohne Mitwirkung des Paulus (121). Dieser schlägt eher den Verzicht auf bestimmte Speisen um des Friedens willen vor (1 Kor 8-10; Röm 14). Da Petrus der Tradent der Jesusüberlieferung war, verzichtet Paulus eher ganz auf diese (122-124). Lukas löst das Problem durch Periodisierung der Ära des Petrus und des Paulus in der Apostelgeschichte (126-129). Der entscheidende Vermittlungsvorschlag kommt von Jakobus, was sogar historisch sein könnte (126).

In einem letzten Abschnitt schildert H. "Die unbekannten Jahre des Petrus und seine theologische und missionarische Bedeutung" (129-162). Theologisch sieht H. in Petrus die Brücke zwischen Jesus und Paulus (129). Er gehört zu den wichtigsten "Augenzeugen" und Garanten der Jesusbotschaft (ebd., vgl. Lk 1,1-4). In der Evangelientradition ist Petrus der maßgebliche Jünger, der Vermittler hin zum Mittler Jesus (133). Die Theologie des Petrus ist wohl nicht so weit von der des Paulus entfernt. Er vertritt wohl nicht Beschneidung und Ritualgesetze (vgl. 1 Kor 1), und er sieht das Heil nicht in Werken des Gesetzes, sondern im Glauben (Gal 2,16, zusammen mit Paulus). Das zeigt auch seine Intervention auf dem Apostelkonzil Apg 15,7-11. Die Quellenfrage ist nach H. nicht ganz so hoffnungslos, wie sie erscheint: Lukas scheint vor allem in der Apostelgeschichte von Petrus beeinflusst zu sein. (138). Markus dürfte sich dazu gesellen (139). In der Folge schildert H. Petrus als Organisator und Missionsstrategen. Hier dient vor allem die

Apostelgeschichte als Leitfaden. Für eine mögliche Versöhnung zwischen Petrus und Paulus fehlen die Texte, doch darf man sie erhoffen aufgrund der Grundeinstellung der beiden Apostelfürsten (158). Markus könnte ein Bindeglied zwischen beiden gewesen sein. Beide Traditionen verbinden auch 1 Petr und 2 Petr. Die römische Tradition und Liturgie verbinden beide Apostelfürsten (161). Zu ihnen gesellt sich als Drittes das Corpus Iohanneum (ebd.).

Die Argumentation des Tübinger Autors klingt durchweg plausibel. Vor und neben Paulus ist Petrus offenbar im Urchristentum die führende Gestalt. Wie erwähnt, sieht H. ihn als Bindeglied zwischen Jesus und Paulus (129). Etwas zu rasch fällt dagegen wohl das Urteil H.s aus, von den neutestamentlichen Texten führe kein Weg zum päpstlichen Primat; dieser sei zu persönlich gewesen (157, Anm. 323, vgl. 162). Seit dem Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil hat es zu dieser Frage einen bedeutenden ökumenischen Dialog gegeben, den man vielleicht nicht ganz ignorieren sollte. So sei stellvertretend für viele andere Publikationen der Sammelband "Peter in the New Testament" genannt, in dem amerikanische protestantische und katholische Neutestamentler der Petrusfrage in neutestamentlicher Sicht nachgehen und als Gruppe zu mehr Offenheit in der Frage eines nicht nur persönlichen "Primats" des Petrus gelangen. Die Autoren waren führende Vertreter ihres Fachs wie Raymond E. Brown, John Reumann oder Karl P. Donfried (deutsch: *Der Petrus der Bibel* [Stuttgart 1976]).

Lesenswert ist auch der zweite Beitrag H.s in dem hier vorgelegten Band. Die Tatsache dass Petrus verheiratet war, findet zumeist wenig Interesse. Doch schon die Geschichte von der Heilung seiner Schwiegermutter in Mk 1,29-31 par. lässt daran ja keinen Zweifel, vgl. 1 Kor 9,5. Hinzu kommen Nachrichten über andere verheiratete Apostel (vgl. erneut 1 Kor 9,5). Nach den Pastoralbriefen soll sich ein Bischof in seiner Familie bewährt haben (1 Tim 3,4; vgl. Tit 1,6 für die Ältesten). An der Spitze paulinischer Gemeinden standen Ehepaare wie Aquilas und Priszilla (195) oder Andronikos und Junia (198). Noch Clemens von Alexandrien stand der Ehe grundsätzlich aufgeschlossen gegenüber und war wohl selbst verheiratet (200). Er kämpft gegen den Enkratismus, weiß aber auch um den Nutzen der Ehelosigkeit für die Mission. Noch im 11. Jahrhundert verteidigt Theophylakt die Ehe des Petrus gegen die Tendenz zum Priesterzölibat in der cluniacensischen Reform (210-211). Freilich setzt sich dann diese Tendenz doch in der lateinischen Kirche fort, nicht zuletzt auf Grund von Argumenten der kultischen Reinheit. Der Beitrag H. kann hier erneut eine Einladung zu einem ökumenischen Dialog sein. Dieser könnte und sollte auch die von Rom getrennten und die mit Rom verbundenen Ostkirchen umfassen, die zwar die Priesterehe zulassen, aber nicht den verheirateten Bischof vorsehen. So schließt H. seine Studie denn auch mit dem Fazit, dass es von Anfang an in der Kirche zwei Tendenzen gab: den Verzicht auf die Ehe um der Sendung willen und die Hochschätzung der christlichen Familie als Stützpunkt der Mission (219).



Edward W. KLINK III, *The Sheep of the Fold. The Audience and Origin of the Gospel of John* (SNTSMS 141). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007. xvi-316 p. 14 × 22. £50.00 – \$95.00

This splendid volume is an important contribution to the new discussion of the audiences of the New Testament Gospels, and the first lengthy treatment of the audience of the Fourth Gospel from the vantage point of that discussion. A consensus that each of the four Gospels was written for a single Christian community emerged toward the end of the nineteenth century and has surprisingly never been seriously challenged or even debated until now. Many of us have proceeded to take for granted that each of the canonical Gospels was written specifically for one *community* (another notion that has been taken for granted).

The recent questioning of this assumption seems to have begun with lectures by R. Bauckham in 1995. Instead of supposing that each of the Gospels was intended for one specific Christian community, Bauckham and others propose that they were composed with a variety of Christian groups in mind and circulated among them. The proposal is attracting more and more attention and to that purpose Klink's dissertation makes an astonishing contribution. It is the first exhaustive study of John in the context of the question of that Gospel's audience and origin. With remarkable comprehensiveness it presents the substance of E. Klink's dissertation at Saint Andrews, Scotland, under the supervision of R. Bauckham.

In this study the author systematically pursues each of the questions that comprise the situation of the Gospel's audience, beginning with a definition of "community" as the word is used by contemporary critical methods (chapter 1), followed by careful analyses of the proposals for the composition and function of Christian community, sectarianism, and patristic exegesis (chapter 2). His perspective entails what he calls "a relational model of community" regardless of the audience's geographical positioning. This necessitates that he speak to the issue of Johannine "sectarianism" and the often-used adjective "antilanguage". For Klink, neither of these adequately describes Johannine Christianity. He concludes that the fourth Gospel "reveals an audience that was connected to a broader section of early Christianity and its culture at large than sectarian and antilanguage readings are able to demonstrate" (87). Among other things, this means that the patristic evidence is insufficient as a basis upon which to argue that the Gospel materials were predetermined entirely by historical settings.

Chapter 3 begins the book's treatment of J. L. Martyn's influential "two-level reading of the Gospel of John" as a drama. Since such a reading merges *bios* and apocalyptic forms, Klink believes it would be entirely foreign to the first-century reader. Moreover, against Martyn's declaration that 9,22 would have been utterly anachronistic if its setting was later than the early part of the century, Klink suggests that it simply describes the conflict between Jews and Christians and in this case is read back into the story in chapter 9.

We may, then, consider the possibility that the Fourth Gospel was written not for a local community caught up in a conflict with Judaism. To do so entails a "literal" rather than an "allegorical" interpretation, such as Martyn

proposes. Klink explains, literal explications of the Gospels “reads them according to their ‘surface-level’ subject matter” (147). Such a reading implies that we assume the text “...*intends* to refer to persons, events, and places in the world outside the text, and that the individual pericopae are not isolated entities but are embedded in a narrative continuum” (148). The evangelist may have written in a time of Jewish-Christian conflict but the text does not *require* such an assumption. A literal reading of John 9 does not necessarily evidence a situation in which Christians had been expelled from the synagogue but only a local conflict between Jews and Christians.

In Chapter 4, Klink employs a very different method of investigation, namely, the construction of the reader implied in the text, that is, the reader the author seems to have expected and for whom the narrative was written. All the evidence related to the implied author results in an image quite different from the one Martyn and others suggest. Klink does an expansive investigation of every feature of the Gospel narratives that might suggest something about the readers. He thinks it is revealing, first, that the word, “Messiah”, is translated and, second, that “the beloved disciple” has to be introduced. All of the evidence of the identity of the implied readers “makes a single ‘group,’ audience, even an heterogeneous one, almost inconceivable” (182). While some readers may disagree with the author’s construction of the implied reader, the breadth of the search is compelling.

Chapter 5 is a sort of pre-conclusion which uses five “test cases” to substantiate the proposal that the Fourth Gospel was intended for a general audience and not a specific community. A number of these examinations are of special importance to Klink. The heterogeneous nature of characters in the story seems to point to the fact that the author is not writing for his own community but inviting different groups to share the Gospel story. Its characters appear to represent a variety of readers. The study succeeds, Klink believes, in opening the text “to be read afresh in the light of the rhetorical ‘witness’ it proclaims” (246). He suggests, “The conclusion of this book, then, is that both the use and concept of “community” in the historical depiction of the Gospel audiences and as the beginning assumption in the interpretation of the Gospel narrative be abandoned” (251).

One of the most impressive features of this study is the thoroughness with which the author argues his thesis and the vast range of evidence he musters. In the process of pursuing his goal, Klink surfaces some of the fundamental assumptions of our discipline. Although it is not explicit in Klink’s study, the concern for the situation of those to whom an evangelist wrote and how their writing was interpreted are extensions of the classical method of biblical interpretation and has become the primary — even basic — way by which contemporary scholars seek the meaning/message of an ancient document. Classical form and redaction criticism flourished with the effort to develop as fully as possible the setting in which the Gospels were interpreted. The more we could squeeze out of the text regarding the situation of the readers, the more detailed our understanding of the meaning they found in a Gospel text.

This led eventually to debating the smallest of details implicit in the Gospels until we seemed to be tearing our common concerns to pieces. How many different groups did the evangelist mean to distinguish with the various characters in the Gospel? As Klink implies, at the hands of critics the Gospel

seems to be transformed into a “deep-rooted polemic with others Jesus traditions” (245).

Klink puts an expansive feast before us, many items of which constitute meals in themselves, but each of which is rich in nutrients. How should we think of the communities of the first century and how does it shape our notion of what it means for a writing to be a community document? Contemporary Fourth Gospel scholarship is deeply embedded in communal assumptions, but to take Klink seriously would mean we need to go back and rethink many of our long-held views of the Gospel, and maybe that is exactly what this new age of ours (call it postmodern or whatever you will) demands. One thing of which I am quite certain is that the time has come for us to question long held views, not least of all, the notion that John was written for a specific community.

However, this study also puts in focus some of the larger issues we cannot escape, e.g., “literal” (in the sense H. Frei uses it) and “allegorical” interpretation. While Klink correctly poses the difference between these two types of reading, his discussion calls for further reflection. Following F. Watson’s lead in an article in R. Bauckham’s *The Gospels for All Christians. Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Edinburgh 1998) 195-217, Klink stresses that a literal interpretation of a text is of a “more pre-critical” reading that focuses attention on “‘the surface-level’ subject matter” (147). However, that does not mean readers are not invited into the symbolic and metaphorical meaning of Johannine language. Still, Klink believes allegorical interpretation distracts attention from the historical Jesus in order to emphasize a spiritual message that floats free of historical narrative. Klink’s mentor, R. Bauckham, also contrasts the literal with the allegorical interpretation of Gospel to describe the ways the historical features of a narrative are used to construct the community behind the Gospels (*Gospels for All Christians*, 18-21). While all this is most suggestive, it calls for more thorough attention to find the line between, for instance, discernment of the message of the Gospel and total allegorization.

Klink has transported the debate over the audiences of the Gospels into the house of Johannine scholarship, where it may indeed cause some commotion, but it cannot be ignored. One of the shocking revelations of the work of these scholars who want to reestablish the Gospels as originally documents intended to be circulated widely among Christians is how deeply embedded the notion of “community” has become in contemporary biblical scholarship. It seems that the longer an assumption is taken to be true, the more resistance there is to reevaluating it. After you and I have devoted so much of our lives to the study of documents supposed to have been related to some geographical cluster of Christians in the first and second centuries, we are tempted to turn deaf ears to any who challenge the assumption. The group of scholars for which Klink speaks seeks to do us a favor by nudging us in another direction, and we repudiate our scholarship if we resist that creative prodding.

### Varia

Kenton L. SPARKS, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible. A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2005. xxxvii-514 p., 16 × 23,5

This volume provides an introductory commentary on the variety of ancient Near Eastern and Classical texts that are deemed relevant to the study of the Hebrew Bible. It functions much as an introductory survey of the Bible might, with brief comments on each piece of literature, describing origin, date, copies, state of preservation, contents and possible (dis)similarities with the Bible. A large amount of space is devoted to bibliography, both for each piece of ancient Near Eastern literature and for general categories. The chapters are divided according to genres. The introduction provides an interesting discussion of the history of genre study and some of the major traits used in identifying different genres. The chapter concludes (21): "On virtually every important issue... one finds a broad range of perspectives that can differ markedly". Sparks' divisions begin with what he regards as the broad categories that will provide background for the other genres. This means the archives and libraries, and then the wisdom literature.

Thus the work begins with a useful survey of languages and the archives represented by them. A general discussion of writing practices gives way to a listing and discussion of collections of written texts, including some Aramaic collections containing only a dozen documents (though why not also mention Samaria, Arad, Lachish, and other Hebrew collections here?). Difficulty arises with questions about literacy. Is it true that "2 percent or less of the population was fully literate" (31) in the ancient Near East? Perhaps. but there is no evidence for this, and it is clear that more than professional scribes could write and read, even in complex syllabic scripts such as Akkadian. Further, to note that Jamieson-Drake and Lemche have argued that "Israel's political and economic apparatus was too small to support a class of scribes" (31) is true; but to argue that there was no "complex" educational system in Judah (32) and that Israel was dependent on a small corps of scribes to do its reading and writing is not necessarily true. Indeed, the book appeared before the discovery of the tenth century Tel Zayit abecedary that, like the Izbet Sartah abecedary from a century earlier, demonstrates the increasing presence of learning how to read and write in the rural as well as urban regions of Israel and Judah (R. Hess, "Writing about Writing: Abecedaries and Evidence for Literacy in Ancient Israel", *BBR* 56 [2006] 342-346).

The chapter on wisdom literature focuses on the great variety of wisdom in all the major civilizations of the ancient world. There are many useful discussions here, such as the Instructions of Amenemope and its comparison with Prov 22-23 (70-71). On the other hand, it may be worthwhile to observe (with others such as V. Hurowitz) that Shube'awilum's dialogue (61) seems to have a distinctively (though not exclusively) West Semitic and Hittite provenance for most of its copies, and that this second millennium BC composition resembles both Proverbs (in the father's optimistic evaluation of

the world) and Ecclesiastes (in the son's contrarian pessimism). The listing of the Hittite instruction and protocol manuals may also have interest in texts such as the ordering of the Israelite tribes in their marches in Numbers.

The ch. on Hymns, Prayers, and Laments includes important discussions on the Mesopotamian laments (many in the Emesal dialect 85). The numerous comparisons with Hebrew psalms deserve mention, but one suspects that there are universal elements in laments and praise that reflect the human condition on many levels; as for example, in the Akkadian *ŠULLA* prayers that involve raising the hands in prayer and a three-part form (address, prayer, and thanksgiving) (103). Among the additional prayers and hymns there is mention of the fascinating Papyrus Amherst 63 and its unusual rendition of Ps 20, and the unique Ugaritic prayer to Baal for deliverance from enemies. An important observation (119) notes the common genre connections with all sorts of Psalms and ancient Near Eastern poetry. The one exception is found in the historical psalms. Sparks finds no parallel for these records of God's historic acts of redemption on behalf of Israel.

The discussion of love poetry is interesting though the only real comparison can be with the biblical Song of Songs. It is not clear that this has anything to do with the grand theme of the Dumuzi-Inanna mythic poetry of Mesopotamian origins or that it can be compared to the Ugaritic sacred marriage liturgy of KTU 1.23. Sparks is surely correct in arguing that the closest parallels with the biblical text are found in the Egyptian love poetry. However, it is not the case that the sexual metaphors of the Song are "far bolder" than the Egyptian parallels (141; nor does Michael Fox actually state this in the reference that Sparks' cites; instead Fox correctly observes that the general use of metaphors in the Song was far bolder than what is found in the Egyptian poems). Further, the absence of "narrative momentum" in the Song does not prove that the work is an anthology. Love poetry is not concerned with narrative in most cases. No matter how long the Song is in comparison with other love poetry, this does not demonstrate that the work is an anthology. To the contrary, repeated words, phrases, and themes (often word for word) argue for an integrated whole to the poem (R. Hess, *Song of Songs* [Baker Commentary on the Old Testament wisdom and Psalms; Grand Rapids 2007]).

The ch. on Rituals and Incantations begins, as do many others, with a brief discussion of past approaches to biblical and other rituals. To the bibliography one might now supplement G. Klingbeil's *Bridging the Gap: Ritual and Ritual Texts in the Bible* (BBRSup 1; Winona Lake 2007). There is important discussion of the cleansing and opening of the mouth rituals in Mesopotamia and Egypt. Others are recounted and compared with some of the biblical rites; although it is not clear that the *tāmīd* in Num 28,1-8 constitutes two meals for Yahweh (150). Sparks considers many of the Ugaritic rituals and the similar terminology. His tendency to see Israelite ritual as closely related to Ugarit is evident in the comment (153): "Perhaps the most striking difference between the Ugaritic and Israelite cultic literature is that the king has no prominent role in the priestly legislation of the Hebrew Bible. Most biblical scholars believe that this reflects only the postexilic context in which the Israelite Priestly Code was edited. It is likely that the king played a more prominent role in the temple cults of pre-exilic Israel and Judah". In fact, just the opposite is true in several

important rituals at Emar, a West Semitic city contemporary with Ugarit and its texts. Although Sparks does mention the Emar rituals, he does not appreciate them fully. Unlike cosmopolitan Ugarit, thirteenth century BC Emar represented an inland and more agrarian society, closer to contemporary Israel. In the texts describing its most important rituals, the king is also absent as in Israel. There are also processions similar to the ark (2 Samuel 6; 1 Chronicles 15–16; 155). The priestly installation ritual with its anointing of blood and oil uniquely resembles that found in Leviticus 8–9 in a manner that is lost when this is lumped together with the more distant Mesopotamian ordination ritual for the priest of Enlil (206–207). Further, the remarkable similarity between the unique multi-month ritual calendar at Emar and that described in Leviticus 23, a similarity in both form and content, is overlooked in describing vague relationships with later Mesopotamian temple texts (208–208). See now R. S. Hess, *Israelite Religions: An Archaeological and Biblical Survey* (Grand Rapids 2007) 52–54, 112–123; IDEM, “Multi-Month Ritual Calendars in the West Semitic World”, *The Future of Biblical Archaeology: Reassessing Methodologies and Assumptions* (ed. J. Hoffmeier – A. Millard) (Grand Rapids 2004) 233–253.

Sparks makes a great deal of the Neo-Babylonian *kuppuru* ritual and how it must have been imitated and borrowed by the Jews in the Exile when they composed Leviticus 16 (161–162, 208). While smearing a dead animal carcass over a temple in order to purify it may seem to resemble the Leviticus ritual, it is not clear why Israelite priests should choose a Mesopotamian ritual not involving (or presumably of interest to) the general public to inhibit Jewish assimilation to Babylonian religion.

In the ch. on Omens and Prophecies, the focus on both the Mari prophecies and the Neo-Assyrian prophecies (224–230) provides an introduction to these extremely interesting texts and their background for understanding biblical prophecies. Despite the ideological shaping of prophecies, it is not clear that we have versions of essentially the same prophecy in three Mari texts, as Sparks seems to suggest (226). Given the different origins, content, and lengths of these three, it seems rather that we have the same proverb incidentally referred to in what are otherwise three different contexts. This seems to call into question the conclusion that these prophecies were profoundly altered and shaped between their oral delivery and their written reception. Whether or not biblical prophecies have been editorially changed from their original context (235–236), the comparative argument has not been established. Comparisons are further weakened by Neo-Assyrian prohibitions against criticism of the government that contrast with the regular attacks of Israelite prophets on their own nations (236). The Israelite Urim and Thummim, a simple form of divination, may not have been borrowed from Mesopotamian practices in the sixth and fifth centuries BC. This is true simply because such practices are already attested in the West Semitic cultural environment of Late Bronze Age Ugarit.

The ch. on apocalyptic texts is one of the best brief summaries on the subject with some valuable, if not new, connections with the marginalization and suffering of the Jewish community that produced their own forms of this genre.

“Tales and Novellas” includes a useful survey of the contents of the

great Egyptian stories. One of the difficulties here is the judgment as to the historical worth of various texts. For example, we read that Wen Amun must be fictional because of its realism in its careful development of dialogues and literary beauty. Yet other texts such as the Tale of the Shipwrecked Sailor must be fiction because characters do not respond in the expected manner of people (257). Again, this is applied to Hebrew tales to evaluate their historical worth (267). But the use of internal criteria, sometimes in a contradictory fashion, to evaluate historical worth is fraught with difficulties. The form and literary quality of a text cannot be used to determine the historical value of its content, without other criteria. One wonders if the same may be said of Epics and Legends, and the discussion covered there. Further, the reverse is true in the ch. on historiography. In king lists, annals, and other historical sources, the literary quality of the works do not define their historical usefulness. These are separate categories. In addition, there seems to be an absence of appreciation of the distinctions between king lists and the biblical genealogies. Even the Greek Catalogue of Women does not so much relate to Genesis 10, given the former's incorporation of mythic groups and its focus on Greek states, as it does the opening chs. of 1 Chronicles which correspondingly focus on Israel. See R. Hess, "The Genealogies of Genesis 1–11 and Comparative Literature", *"I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood": Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1–11* (ed. R. Hess - D. Tsumura) (SBTS 4; Winona Lake 1994) 58–72.

The chapter on myths recounts some of the best-known examples of ancient Near Eastern literature. The historiography ch. is valuable for summaries of the most important ancient Near Eastern sources. More emphasis could have been placed on West Semitic sources, e.g., Yahdunlim's inscription and Idrimi's account (which Sparks sees as folklore [288] and ignores the societal changes that take place during and after Idrimi's reign and thus reflect the historical significance of the narrative, see R. Hess, "Occurrences of Canaan in Late Bronze Age Archives of the West Semitic World", *IOS* 18 [1998] 365–372). Sparks' examination of legal collections helpfully distinguishes between those intended as realistic and those more propagandistic in nature. The editorial revisions of the Hittite laws are of special interest and may be compared with the biblical evolution of laws. However, here one should look at the actual development between biblical legal collections where, for example, there is a similar decrease in severity of punishments for the same infraction. The ch. on Treaties and Covenants is also important for understanding the treaty background of Deuteronomy and other biblical texts. It suffers from the compunction to compare these texts with Neo-Assyrian treaties and to ignore the implications of a closer structural connection between Deuteronomy and Hittite treaties, i.e., historical, deposit, and blessings clauses common to both but not found in Neo-Assyrian or Aramaic treaties (the putative "blessings" clause in only one Sefire treaty consists of six words in a broken context followed immediately by structurally similar clauses that are clearly curses). The work concludes with a review of some important Hebrew inscriptions. It was published too early to appreciate the responses to criticisms of the authenticity of such artifacts at the Jerusalem pomegranate.

The above critiques and comments only serve to demonstrate the provocative and engaging nature of this remarkably complete and useful work. Sparks has filled a gap in the comparative library of Hebrew Bible study by providing an excellent introduction and single-volume commentary to this key area of study.

Denver Seminary  
6399 South Santa Fe Drive  
Denver, CO 80120

Richard S. HESS

Giuseppe VELTRI, *Libraries, Translations, and 'Canonic' Texts. The Septuagint, Aquila and Ben Sira in the Jewish and Christian Traditions* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 109). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2006. xi-278 p. 16 × 24,5. €105 - \$142.00.

This wide-ranging and fascinating volume is the latest monograph by Giuseppe Veltri, Professor of Jewish Studies at Halle University. His 1991 doctoral dissertation on the LXX, undertaken at the Free University of Berlin, was published as *Eine Tora für den König Talmi: Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ; Tübingen 1994). The present volume develops arguments presented there and in two subsequent publications: *Magie und Halakha: Ansätze zu einem empirischen Wissenschaftsbegriff im spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Judentum* (TSAJ; Tübingen 1997) and *Gegenwart der Tradition: Studien zur jüdischen Literatur und Kulturgeschichte* (JSJSup; Leiden - Boston 2002). The foreword outlines Veltri's purpose of explaining why the LXX fell into disuse in Judaism. Whereas many scholars see this process as a Jewish reaction to the Christian "takeover" of the translation, he suggests that a more important element was a shift in the center of gravity of Jewish life from the Mediterranean to Babylon. Accordingly, he regards the activity of the Babylonian Rabbis as deconstructing the earlier authority of the LXX (and also of Ben Sira).

The introduction bears the title "(De)canonization and Deconstruction". Observing that the whole question of canon and canonization has recently become a focus of academic discussion, Veltri refers to six volumes on the topic from 2003 and 2004 (1, n. 2), though he surprisingly overlooks an important collection of essays edited by Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders, *The Canon Debate* (Peabody, MA 2002). Veltri asserts: "The gradual Rabbinic turning away from the oldest Greek translation of the Torah, the so-called Septuagint, ... is due to the loss of the Greek language among the Jews and the disappearance of the Jewish community of Alexandria" (6-7). After considering two models of canonization (the traditional view of the Torah as a unique gift from God, and the negative theory of the canon as censorship), Veltri advocates the third "paradigmatic" model, whereby a text recognized as "canonical" is given a general validity unconnected with its



original context of composition, though this development can also be reversed in a process of decanonization.

The first chapter, on “Libraries and Canon: Ascent and Decline of the Greek Torah”, opens with a helpful survey of Hellenistic Jewish authors on the origin of the LXX (Aristobulus, Aristaeas, Philo, Josephus). Then Veltri offers a wide-ranging overview of early Christian attitudes to the LXX (Justin Martyr, Pseudo-Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Julius Africanus, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Epiphanius of Salamis, Hilary of Poitiers, Augustine, Jerome). Veltri offers enlightenment here, especially on the debate between Augustine and Jerome on the authority of the LXX. The view that the Greek translation was inspired (already found in Philo, *De Vita Mosi* 2,37) influenced many patristic writers such as Augustine (*De Civitate Dei* 15,42), but not Jerome (*Praefatio in Pentateuchum* 181-182). The number of Septuagintal translators in the Legend of Aristaeas may have arisen because it matched the 72 grammarians who (according to Aulus Gellius, Tertullian, and Isidore of Seville) edited the works of Homer at the instigation of Pisistratus. A comparable legend appears in 4 Ezra 14,42-47, where Ezra dictates 70 hidden books as well as the 24 books of the Hebrew Bible. Veltri concludes the first chapter by referring to the famous Alexandrian library: “Alexandria of Egypt was a school of canonization of Greek literature in its editions and propagation of books (scrolls) and commentary on them”, and the edition of the LXX “succeeded in universalising Jewish traditions and law” (99).

Chapter 2 is entitled “Deconstructing History and Traditions: The Written Torah for Ptolemy”. After claiming that “the Rabbinic attitude toward Greek culture and language was positive” (101), Veltri sets out to show (in contrast to some other scholars) that the Greek text of the Torah was highly honored by many Rabbis, since they sometimes depicted the origin of the LXX as analogous to the divine revelation to the seventy elders in Exodus 24. Then follows a fascinating survey of Rabbinic comments (e.g., from *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah*) on several “changed verses” where the LXX differs from the Hebrew text (Gen 1,1; 1,26-27 with 5,1-2; 2,2; 11,7; 18,12; 49,6; Exod 4,20; 12,40; Num 16,15; Deut 4,19 with 17,3). An interesting paragraph observes that while the Hebrew text of Lev 11,6 includes the rabbit among the unclean animals, “the Septuagint translated *arnevet* with *dasypous*, not with *lagōs*” (137), to avoid offending King Ptolemy Philadelphus, who belonged to the dynasty of *Lagides*! Rabbinic tradition knows the LXX as “the Torah for King Talmi [= Ptolemy]”, produced to fulfil the command that the king should have a Torah scroll written for him (Deut 17,18). The Rabbis could justify the Septuagintal changes in the Pentateuch by reinterpreting the *mishneh torah* (“copy of the Torah”) in Deut 17,18 as *meshanneh torah* (“he changes the Torah”). However, the Rabbis were able to limit the importance of the LXX “by stressing that it was written for a foreign king as didactical help” (146).

In the third chapter (“Deconstructing Translations: The Canonical Substitution Aquila/Onkelos”), Veltri notes the significance of translation activity in guarding the canon of sacred books. Unlike other scholars, Veltri sees the work of Greek translators and Aramaic Targumists as essentially similar. He then considers attitudes toward Aquila in patristic and Rabbinic

texts. According to Veltri, the patristic view that the translator Aquila came from Pontus in Asia Minor is probably a borrowing from Acts 18,2, where the apostle Paul finds “a Jew named Aquila, a native of Pontus”. The Rabbinic dating of Aquila to the time of Hadrian may reflect a desire for Roman acknowledgement of the Jewish people. Veltri discusses several passages in Rabbinic texts dealing with exegetical difficulties and mentioning examples from Aquila’s translation (Gen 17,1; Lev 23,24; Isa 3,20; Ezek 16,10; 23,43; Ps 48[47],15; Prov 18,21; 25,11; Esth 1,6; Dan 5,5). He explains how in Babylon the Aramaic Targum of Onkelos took over the authoritative mantle of Aquila’s Greek translation in Palestine, though Veltri hardly touches on the alleged correspondence between Theodotion and Targum Jonathan.

In Chapter 4, on “(De)canonization in the Making: The Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirā”, Veltri asserts that the Rabbis sought to marginalize Ben Sirā’s work because it competed against their teaching authority. The epigram at the head of the chapter cites Rabbi Akiva’s rejection of Ben Sirā’s book for liturgical reading (y. *Sanh.* 10,1), but the quotation from Qoh 12,12 (correctly identified elsewhere, 213) is here misattributed to Ben Sirā (190). Veltri then presents his views of the prologue to the Greek text of Ben Sirā. Here he claims that the Greek word *legomena* (literally, “things said”) refers to “something spoken, not ... written” (198), even though he later renders the Rabbinic expression *she ne’emar* (literally, “as it was said”) with the phrase “as it [is] written” (206). Whereas Veltri asserts that “both Josephus and the author of the Fourth Gospel use *Hebraisti* for Aramaic terms” (198), it is more likely that in Rev 9,11 (“Abaddon”) and Rev 16,16 (“Armageddon”) the reference is to Hebrew words, as in the Greek prologue to Ben Sirā.

Veltri mostly follows common practice in referring to the translator of Ben Sirā as the “grandson” (41, 191, 196, 220), but elsewhere he calls him Ben Sirā’s “nephew” (152) or “descendent” (201), in accordance with his footnoted observation that “the term *pappos* can mean either ‘grandfather’ or ‘forefather’” (201, n. 38). Veltri suggests that the dating in the Greek prologue to Ben Sirā is not to be taken literally, because the “grandson” uses many neologisms and words that do not appear till the first century C.E. (196, n. 16). Here Veltri overlooks the monograph by Christian Wagner, *Die Septuaginta-Hapaxlegomena im Buch Jesus Sirach* (BZAW 282; Berlin 1999), which shows that while the prologue has 18 hapaxes, the rest of the Greek text has 232 hapaxes, many of them seemingly neologisms. In addition, Veltri asserts that because the prologue’s style differs from that of the main Greek text, the two parts derive from different authors (203 n. 48), although the similar case of Luke’s Gospel casts doubt on this theory.

Chapter 4 also considers a number of Rabbinic quotations of Ben Sirā texts (Sir 5,11; 6,32 [Syriac]; 7,17; 13,25; 25,3; 28,12; 38,1.4.7-8). However, in y. *Ber.* 7,2 the reference to Sir 6,32 [Syriac] is less likely than an allusion to Sir 11,1, while in b. *B.B.* 98b mention of the quotation of Prov 18,13 ignores its echo in Sir 11,8 (see also 4Q420 1,2,1). Then Veltri considers the longest Talmudic allusion to Ben Sirā in b. *Sanh.* 100b (also in b. *Yeb.* 63b), but his list of references needs amplifying (Sir 42,9-10; 30,23; 11,29; 26,3; 25,26; 26,1; 9,8-9; 11,32; 6,6). On this complex passage Veltri overlooks David S. Levene’s article, “Theology and Non-Theology in the Rabbinic Ben Sirā”, in *Ben Sirā’s God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sirā*

*Conference Durham – Ushaw College 2001* (ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel) (BZAW 321; Berlin 2002) 305-320.

After the conclusion summarizing the book, the work ends with an extensive bibliography of primary and secondary texts, and indexes of ancient references, ancient and medieval names, and subjects (but not modern authors). In the handling of such a broad range of sources, it is easy for errors to creep in, and regrettably the bibliography contains some inaccuracies; for instance, Marguerite Harl is called “Margherite Harle” (247), Eberhard Nestle is given the surname “Nestel” (252), and E. P. Sanders is named as “Sander” (240). English-speaking readers may be amused when they encounter “Irenaeus of Lion” (233) and “Epiphanius of Salami” (138).

The author’s erudition is impressive as he refers to a wide variety of ancient, medieval and modern sources, whether Jewish or Christian or pagan. Yet I felt slightly disappointed that despite many illuminating observations, the volume did not provide a full account of the process of decanonization. Although Veltri observes that in the ancient world “libraries were tantamount to what today is called ‘canon’” (27), there is no detailed treatment of the exact workings of ancient libraries, despite some discussion of the Alexandrian library (33-37 and 81-90). While there is a brief consideration of scrolls held at the Jerusalem temple (135-137), and of Judas Maccabeus’ collecting of books according to 2 Macc 2,13-15 (202-203), the volume lacks a wider comparative survey of the role of ancient libraries in education.

In fact, the book’s major focus is neither libraries nor the canon as such, nor the texts of the LXX or Aquila or Ben Sira in their original context. Rather, its main subject is the use and disuse of the Septuagint, Aquila and Ben Sira in Jewish tradition, with some comparisons to patristic views. While Veltri illuminates the reception history of the LXX and Ben Sira in post-biblical Judaism, I personally found the overarching theory of canonization and decanonization rather distracting. Such language might suggest a very fixed idea of canon, even though Veltri aims to show its fluidity. In fact, the evidence of canonical status is often ambiguous. For example, while Jerome mentions seeing a Hebrew text of Ben Sira (PL 29,427-428), he does not regard the work as canonical (PL 28,1242), yet elsewhere he cites the book with the phrase “scripture says” (PL 24,67D). Similarly, while the Talmud excludes Ben Sira from the canon (y. *Sanh.* 10,1), elsewhere it quotes the work as authoritative, even with a biblical introduction such as the Hebrew term *katuv* (“it is written”: *b. Hag.* 13a, quoting Sir 3,21-22) or the Aramaic equivalent *ketiv* (y. *Ber.* 7,2, alluding to Sir 11,1 as well as Prov 4,8; *b. B.B.* 98b, echoing Sir 11,8 as well as Prov 18,13; *b. B.Q.* 92b, referring to Sir 27,9 and 13,15).

In conclusion, this wide-ranging study is like a huge painting of a panoramic scene, where some parts are depicted in great detail, while other areas are left with broad brush strokes. Veltri offers many fascinating insights into how the Rabbis treated the Greek biblical translations and the Hebrew sayings of Ben Sira, but I suspect that he has not said the last word on the question of the canonization and decanonization of these texts within Judaism.

Hubert FRANKEMÖLLE, *Frühjudentum und Urchristentum. Vorgeschichte – Verlauf – Auswirkungen* (4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.) (Studienbücher Theologie 5), Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 2006. 446 p. 15,5 × 23. €32 – SFr 54,-

The title of this tightly-printed volume suggests that it is meant to be an introductory handbook on early Judaism and early Christianity. The series in which it is published points in the same direction. In fact, the author aims to live up to the broad title, setting, however, specific emphases of his own. The book tries to explain how and why Jews and Christians have such a large common patrimony well beyond the Hebrew Scriptures, why they parted company, and how significant the rediscovery of their continued relatedness may be for both.

A methodological introduction clarifies the problematic character of the terms “Judaism” and “Christianity” in describing the reality of the first centuries. Following Neusner and others, the author prefers to speak of “Judaisms” and “Christianities”, emphasizing that pluralism prevailed in both groups before a “normative” stage or a distinction between “true faith” and “heresy” was reached.

The first chapter provides a broad but concise overview of Jewish history and, in particular, the history of Judaism(s) during the period under discussion. A brief excursus even treats the Falashas of Ethiopia as one example of the diversity of expressions of Judaism. Extensive sections are devoted to Judaism in Egypt and to Jewish literature in Greek, with special attention to the Septuagint and its influence on the separation between Judaism and Christianity. Here F. proposes one of the central theses of his book, namely, that in retrospect the Septuagint (understood as including not only the Pentateuch but also the translation of other books as well as original Greek material) was the decisive cause of the drifting-apart of Christian and non-Christian Jews (76-77).

A final section, “Judentum und Hellenismus in Judäa” (85-127), gives a brief historical overview from the Persian period till after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. As the author emphasizes, the goal is not to provide a complete history, but to highlight those political, linguistic and theological factors that led to the later separation between Pharisaic and Christian Judaisms (“Trennung von pharisäisch geprägtem Judentum und christlich geprägtem Judentum” 85).

Theological developments are in fact the central theme of the book. In particular, chapter 2 focuses on Jewish theological concepts that F. considers related to the later separation between Judaism and Christianity. In a nutshell, this chapter provides an overview of the development of Jewish monotheism and of expressions of God’s nearness. In accord with his central thesis on the importance of language, F. distinguishes sharply between Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek expressions of Jewish theology. Although the Hebrew term *Shekhinah* is post-biblical, it is examined in connection with God’s nearness in the Hebrew Scriptures. A somewhat analogous idea in Greek writings is the concept of *hypostasis*.

Philo is presented not only as an important bridge between Greek

philosophy and Jewish theology. F. goes further by asserting that Philo's reflections on the *logos* are a prerequisite for the Christology of all NT authors who bear the stamp of Greek thought, just as Philo did. Following Sellin, F. asserts that Philo provided "the basic model for Hellenistic Christology" (189).

In the third chapter, entitled "From Reform Judaism to (Early) Christianity", F. attempts to show in what way Hellenistic Judaism in the diaspora as well as in the land of Israel had prepared the way for Hellenistic Christianity, especially by providing the linguistic tools for understanding the person and mission of Jesus ("Das hellenistische Christentum konnte sich nur entwickeln, da das Griechisch sprechende Judentum in der Diaspora, aber auch in Palästina diesen sprachlichen Weg der Glaubensdeutung intensiv vorbereitet hatte", 223). F. locates Jesus entirely in an Aramaic and Hebrew speaking world, whereas all NT authors, beginning with Paul, expressed themselves in the entirely different idiom of the Greek language and Hellenistic culture. F. does not deny that Hellenization had reached Palestine long before Jesus' time. He nevertheless asserts that for Jesus himself and for the earliest interpretations of his person, one needs to exclude from consideration all ideas first attested in early Greek-Jewish writings (237). An important turning point for F. is the conflict between "Hebrews" and "Hellenists" among the early followers of Jesus (Acts 6,1-6). He sees this as evidence for a single community, one part of whose members spoke Aramaic, while the other part spoke Greek. Here language became an important factor not only in social but even in theological questions (244). The author notes that the persecution described in Acts 8,1-2 affected only the Greek-speaking members of the community.

After a nuanced description of the changing relations between Jewish and non-Jewish followers of Jesus, the author offers a brief outline of parallel developments among non-Christian Jews. Following a widely held view, F. assumes that Pharisaic Judaism became normative after the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E.

In an important section that is a real *tour de force* (277-330), F. examines the development of the various theologies in the NT written by Christian Jews for non-Jews. After a detailed discussion of Paul, the views of each of the synoptic writers, John, and other NT authors are examined in their relation to biblical and post-biblical Judaism. F. is aware that such an approach might be seen as providing support for the thesis that Paul was the real founder of Christianity, a conclusion he firmly rejects (296). This chapter concludes with a further discussion of the early Christian writings of the second century.

The fourth and final chapter reviews the relation of (early) Christians to the Jewish Scriptures. The author affirms the continuing centrality of the OT, even in a Christian context. Taking up a point made by the Lutheran Bishop Maria Jepsen, he argues that Christians have to recognize that — astronomically speaking — the New Testament orbits around the Old Testament rather than the other way around. He further argues that the NT, too, is theocentric rather than christocentric (404-405, differently 199). This assertion is documented by a variety of expressions found in different parts of the NT (405-421). Considerations about the theological consequences of the relations between Judaism and Christianity and about the factors that led from

a Jewish reform movement to a government-supported world religion conclude this impressive volume. The indices of sources (biblical and extra-biblical) and of subjects are short but helpful.

The broad scope of this volume in many ways sums up the author's life work. It shows exegetical and theological acumen as well as sensitivity to the historical implications of the relations between early Judaism and early Christianity. An acute awareness of writing about Christian-Jewish relations after the *Shoah* is evidenced from the first to the last page of the book (23, 26, 437 *et passim*). The author gives some vivid examples of how decisive developments cannot be linked to a single moment, but are the results of a complex chain of events, as was the case of the gradual schism between eastern and western Christianity (24).

As pointed out above, one of the main theses of the book concerns the important links between Hellenistic Judaism and Greek-speaking Christianity. F. goes so far as to call the expanded LXX the strongest reason for the later drifting apart of Jews who believed in Christ and those who did not ("die erweiterte LXX als die stärkste Ursache für das spätere Auseinanderdriften von christusgläubigen und nicht-christusgläubigen Juden", 77). For him, the Christian claim that God spoke through Jesus during his entire earthly life could not be formulated on the basis of the Hebrew Scriptures, but presupposes the idea of *hypostaseis* in the Greek (Jewish) Scriptures (168). Therefore he considers the collection of writings called "Septuagint" to be the only possible bridge between Judaism of the Graeco-Roman period and nascent Christianity ("die einzig mögliche Brücke zwischen dem Judentum in der griechisch-römischen Zeit und dem sich daraus entwickelnden Christentum", 176). Elsewhere, F. emphasizes the fundamental importance of Philo's reflections on the *logos* for the Christology of *all* NT authors (189) and assigns him an irreplaceable bridging function between Jewish and Christian theology (199). Such assertions might need some nuancing, since it is not at all clear how well Philo was known by various NT authors. Moreover, divisions along linguistic lines are played down in the recent works of Daniel Boyarin. However, such divisions are emphasized by Edrei and Mendels in ways that are quite analogous to Frankemölle (Arye Edrei – Doron Mendels, "A Split Jewish Diaspora: Its Dramatic Consequences", *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 16 [2007] 91-137). Although the importance of language should not be underestimated, F.'s bold and groundbreaking work invites further research.

In a volume of such ample scope it is obvious that there will be some problematic elements. F. represents an older but now questionable consensus in his frequent references to "Pharisäischer Rabbinismus" (35), or to post-70 "Pharisaic Jews" (436). Elsewhere, he speaks of the consolidation of Pharisaic Judaism after 70 CE (27). Such a view has rightly been challenged by Stemberger and others. Rabbinic Judaism certainly had roots among the earlier Pharisees, but it can no longer be assumed that it was simply a linear continuation of the Pharisaic movement.

As F. makes clear from the beginning, his approach is primarily theological and not historical, although his work is marked by sensitivity to broad historical developments. For historical details, the reader needs to look

elsewhere. References to Josephus and to rabbinic literature are sometimes incomplete or inconsistent, a fact also reflected in the index of sources. These minor quibbles do not detract from the penetrating and important analytical and synthetic work of this admirable volume.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Roma

Joseph SIEVERS

# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

## Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 2008-2009. I semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 304, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	23	240	7	270
Fac. Orientalistica	1	4	29	34
Universi	24	244	36	304
Nationes	59	Alumni	304	
Dioeceses	146	Alumni	152	
Inst. Religiosorum	42	Alumni	92	
Inst. Religiosarum	11	Alumnae	11	
Ex statu laicali	49	Alumnae	26	
		Alumni	23	

## Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

BLUNDA GRUBERT Jorge Martín, *La proclamación de YHWH rey y la constitución de la comunidad postexílica. El Deutero-Isaías en relación con Salmos 96 y 98* (magna cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. SIMIAN-YOFRE Horacio, S.J.

GRANADOS GARCIA Carlos, D.C.J.M.: *La nueva alianza como recreación. Estudio exegético de Ez 36,16-38* (magna cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. BOVATI Pietro, S.J.

ZAWADZKI Arnold Jan, *Osea 10,8-10.11-15 e i suoi echi in Geremia. Un approfondimento esegetico* (cum laude) – Moderatore: Prof. SIMIAN-YOFRE Horacio, S.J.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

AHN So Kun, O.P., *I Salmi 146–150 come conclusione del Salterio* (Roma 2008, pp. 96) [estratto].

BÉRÉ Paul, S.J., *Le second Serviteur de Yhwh. Étude de la figure du protagoniste de Josué* (Roma 2008, pp.106) [estratto].



CABELLO MORALES Pedro, «*Tened cuidado y guardaos de toda codicia*». *Hacia una interpretación conciliadora del tema riqueza-pobreza en Lc-Hch a partir del análisis socio-retórico de Lc 12,13-34* (Roma 2008, pp. 140) [estratto].

BONIFACIO Gianattilio, *Personaggi minori e discepoli in Mc 4-8*. La funzione degli episodi dei personaggi minori nell'interazione con la storia dei protagonisti (Analecta Biblica 173; Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Roma 2008, pp. 293)

RAMIREZ GONZALEZ Rafael Martín, *Influjos sapienciales en el libro de Oseas* (Romae 2008, pp.125) [estratto].

BOU RAAD Joseph, O.A.L.: «*Malheur annoncé, malheur dénoncé*». Étude rhétorique de Jérémie 6 (Éditions de l'Université Antonine [Baabda, Liban] 2008, pp. 472).

ABEYNAIKE Christopher Robert, O.Cist., *The Eucharist in Relation to the Priesthood of Christ in the Letter to the Hebrews* (Romae 2008, pp. 120) [estratto].

## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

Omnes libri ad Directionem missi quodam modo cum rebus biblicis connexi in hoc elencho notantur. Praeterea mandantur redactori *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography* et in eodem *Elencho bibliographico* notantur prout redactori bonum videtur.

Eo autem quod hi libri in Biblica recipiuntur, nullum de iis exprimitur iudicium.

Recensiones de libris aut fient aut non fient, prout Moderatori recensionum opportunum videbitur.

Libri ad Directionem missi, quos Directio periodici non directe recensionis gratia expetiverit, numquam remittuntur, etsi de eis recensio non fit.

Libri mittantur ad «Directio Biblica, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italia».

**Collins**, Billie Jean, *The Hittites and Their World* (Archaeology and Biblical Studies 7). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. xvi-254 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

**Coote**, Robert B. – **Gottwald**, Norman K. (eds.), *To Break Every Yoke*. Essays in Honor of Marvin L. Chaney (The Social World of Biblical Antiquity, Second Series 3). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xii-380 p. 16 × 24

**Crook**, Zeba A. – **Harland**, Philip A. (eds.), *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Jews, Christians and Others. Essays in Honour of Stephen G. Wilson (New Testament Monographs 18). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xvi-292 p. 16 × 24

**Crüsemann**, Frank, *La torà*. Teologia e storia sociale della legge nell'Antico Testamento (Introduzione allo studio della Bibbia Supplementi 36). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2008. 538 p. 15,5 × 23. €53,70

**Dalley**, Stephanie, *Esther's Revenge at Susa*. From Sennacherib to Ahasuerus. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007. xvi-262 p. 14 × 22

**Darko**, Daniel K., *No Longer Living as the Gentiles*. Differentiation and Shared Ethical Values in Ephesians 4,17–6,9 (Library of New Testament Studies 375). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2008. xi-160 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

**Daube**, David, *The Deed and the Doer in the Bible*. David Daube's Gifford Lectures. Volume 1. West Conshohocken, Pennsylvania, Templeton Foundation Press, 2008. xii-300p. 15 × 22,4. \$34.95

**Davidson**, Richard M., *Flame of Yahweh*. Sexuality in the Old Testament. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2007. xxix-844 p. 15 × 23. £16.99

**Davis**, Michael Thomas – **Strawn**, Brent A. (eds.), *Qumran Studies*. New Approaches, New Questions. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007. xxvii-296 p. 16 × 23,5. \$30.00 – £16.99

**de Groot, Christiana – Taylor, Marion Ann** (eds.), *Rediscovering Nineteenth-Century Women Interpreters of the Bible*. Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. ix-244 p. 15 × 23. £16.99

**de Roo, Jacqueline C. R.**, *'Works of the Law' at Qumran and in Paul* (New Testament Monographs 13). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xiv-280 p. 16 × 24

**de Ternay, Henri**, *Avec Job. De l'épreuve à la conversion* (Collection écritures 12). Bruxelles, Lumen Vitae, 2007. 176 p. 15 × 22,5. €20

**de Yong, Matthijs J.**, *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets. A Comparative Study of the Earliest Stages of the Isaiah Tradition and the Neo-Assyrian Prophecies* (Supplements to the Vetus Testamentum 117). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2007. xii-522 p. 16,5 × 24,5. €119 – \$160.00

**DeConick, April D.**, *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation*. With a Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel. London – New York, T&T Clark, 2007. xv-359 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £30.00

**DeConick, April**, *The Thirteenth Apostle*. What the Gospel of Judas Really Says. London – New York, Continuum, 2008. xxi-202 p. 14 × 22

**Delorme, Jean**, *L'heureuse annonce selon Marc*. Lecture intégrale du 2<sup>e</sup> évangile I (LD 219). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2008. 574 p. 13,5 × 21,5. €39

**Díes Merino, L. – Giralt-López, E.** (eds.), *Professor J. Ribera Florit: Targum y Judaísmo* (Col·lecció Homenatges 26). Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona, 2007. 282 p. 17 × 24

**Dietrich, Walter**, *The Early Monarchy in Israel*. The Tenth Century B. C. E. (Biblical Encyclopedia 3). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. xvi-378 p. 15 × 23. \$47.95

**Donaldson, Terence L.**, *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)*. Waco, Baylor University Press, 2007. xvi-563 p. 16 × 23,5. \$59.95 – £33.99

**Edayadiyil, George**, *Exodus Event: Its Historical Kernel*. A study of the origin of the biblical people and the Egyptian Exodus (From Exodus and Beyond 1). Bangalore, Asian Trading Corporation, 2007. xvii-156 p. 14 × 21

**Ederle, Rubén Alberto**, *Discípulos y apóstoles de Jesús*. La relación entre los discípulos y los Doce según Marcos (Tesi Gregoriana, Serie Teología 161). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2008. 364 p. 17 × 24

**Ehrensperger, Kathy**, *Paul and the Dynamics of Power*. Communication and Interaction in the Early Christ-Movement (Library of New Testament Studies 325). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2007. xiv-235 p. 14 × 24. £70.00

**Eichhorn, Albert**, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*. With an Introductory Essay by Hugo Gressmann (History of Biblical Studies 1). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. x-105 p. 15 × 23. \$14.95

**Ellens, J. Harold** (ed.), *Text and Community*. Essays in Memory of Bruce M. Metzger. Volumes 1 and 2 (New Testament Monographs 19 and 20). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xvi-292 p., xiii-270 p. 16 × 24

**Exum, J. Cheryl – Nutu, Ela** (eds.), *Between the Text and the Canvas*. The Bible and Art in Dialogue (The Bible in the Modern World 13). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xiii-246 p. 16 × 24

**Fabry**, Heinz-Josef – **Ringgren**, Helmer (a cura di), *Grande Lessico dell'Antico Testamento*. Volume VII: ער – קרבן. Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2007. xvi p., 1142 coll. 17,5 × 25. €114

**Falcetta**, Alessandro (ed.), *James Rendel Harris*. New Testament Autographs and Other Essays (New Testament Monographs 7). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006. xvi-256 p. 16 × 24

**Federici**, Giulio Cesare, *I pranzi nella Bibbia* (Bibbia e Preghiera) Roma, Edizioni AdP, 2007. 73 p. 14 × 21. €6

**Feldman**, Louis H., *Philo's Portrayal of Moses in the Context of Ancient Judaism* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 15). Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 2007. xix-542 p. 16 × 23,5. \$80.00

**Ferrero**, Michele – **Spataro**, Roberto (a cura di), *"Tuo padre ed io ti cercavamo"* (Lc 2,48). La Terra Santa, la famiglia di Nazareth, modelli educativi. Studi in onore di don Joan Maria Vernet. Jerusalem, Studium Theologicum Salesianum "SS. Peter and Paul", 2007. 336 p. 15,5 × 21,5

**Finkelstein**, Israel – **Mazar**, Amihai, *The Quest for the Historical Israel*. Debating Archaeology and the History of Early Israel (Archaeology and Biblical Studies 17). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. x-220 p. 15 × 23. \$24.95

**Fitzmyer**, Joseph A., *The Inspiration of Scripture*. In Defense of the Historical-Critical Method. New York/Mahwah, Paulist Press, 2008. xii-153 p. 15 × 23. \$18.95

**Flusser**, David – **Notley**, Stephen, *The Sage from Galilee*. Rediscovering Jesus' Genius. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007. xix-191 p. 15 × 23. \$20.0 – £10.99

**Flusser**, David, *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*. Volume 1 Qumran and Apocalypticism. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company – Jerusalem, The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2007. xiii-356 p. 16 × 24. \$36.00 – £19.99

ISSN 0006-0887

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606.

E-mail: [atla@atla.com](mailto:atla@atla.com). <http://www.atla.com/>

---

MICHELE SIMONE, Direttore Responsabile

---

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

---

Finito di stampare il 10 maggio 2009

Tip.: Ist. Salesiano Pio XI - Via Umbertide, 11 - 00181 Roma